

*Kashmir College Srinagar
Pratap Building*

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No. _____

Book No. _____

Accession No. _____

15 FEB 2006

SRI PRAVATAP COLEGE LIBRARY



Class No. 906 Acc^{no}

Book No. P 98 P

Accession No. C 201

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No. _____

Book No. _____

Accession No. _____

PUNJAB GOVERNMENT RECORD OFFICE
PUBLICATION.



PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
FOURTH HISTORICAL CONFERENCE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB

Held in Lahore, January 1929.

General Editor (*acting*):—SITA RAM, Kohli,
Offg. Keeper of the Records of the Government of the Punjab.

Price : Rs. 4-4-0 or 6s. 5d.

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No. _____

Book No. _____

Accession No. _____

FOURTH HISTORICAL CONFERENCE
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE
PUNJAB.

P.P. P

Revised List of Agents for the Sale of Punjab Government Publications.

OF THE CONTINENT AND UNITED KINGDOM.

Publications obtainable either direct from the High Commissioner for India, at India House, Aldwych, London, W. C. 2, or through any bookseller :—

IN INDIA.

The GENERAL MANAGER, "The Qaumi Daler" and the Union Press, Amritsar.

MESSRS. D. B. TARAPOREWALA, SONS & CO., BOMBAY.

The MANAGING PARTNER, The Bombay Book Depôt, Booksellers and Publishers, Girgaon, BOMBAY.

MESSRS. W. NEWMAN & CO., LIMITED, CALCUTTA.

THE PROPRIETOR, The Book Company, CALCUTTA.

MESSRS. THACKER, SPINK & CO., CALCUTTA.

MESSRS. CHATTERJI & CO., Booksellers, 294, Cornwallis Street, CALCUTTA.

MESSRS. RAMA KRISHNA & SONS, LAHORE.

The SECRETARY, Punjab Religious Book Society, LAHORE.

THE MANAGER, Standard Book Depôt, LAHORE.

THE MANAGER, University Book Agency, LAHORE.

L. RAM LAL SURI, PROPRIETOR, "The Students' Own Agency," LAHORE.

L. DEWAN CHAND, Proprietor, The Mercantile Press, LAHORE.

The MANAGER, Mufid-i-Ami Press, LAHORE.

THE PROPRIETOR, Punjab Law Book Mart, LAHORE.

MR. D. PESTONJI, Stockists Representative, LAHORE.

The MANAGING PROPRIETOR, The Commercial Book Company, LAHORE.

R. S. JAURA, Esq., B.A., B.T., The Students' Popular Depôt, ANARKALI, LAHORE.

The PROPRIETOR, Aftah Punjab General Law Book Agency, LAHORE.

MANAGER, Oxford Book and Stationery Co., The Mall, LAHORE.

The PROPRIETOR, City Book Co., Post Box No. 283, MADRAS.

The MANAGER, The New Book Depôt, No. 79, The Mall, SIMLA.

MESSRS. THACKER, SPINK & CO., SIMLA.

acc.no: 6307

Prefatory Note.

ORIGINALLY it was intended to publish the proceedings soon after the Conference sittings had come to an end. But owing to a variety of causes the Secretary, it seems, could not find time to see these papers through the press and subsequently he proceeded on furlough to America. At the request of the Registrar of the Punjab University the work has been entrusted to me. It is necessary to mention here that my task, in connection with the publication of the proceedings of the Conference, is limited to the correcting of the final proofs and in general to the arranging of the material in type and in seeing the report through the press.

RECORD OFFICE : }
September 3rd 1930. }

SITA RAM, KOHLI,

*Offg, Keeper of the Records of the
Government of the Punjab,*

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No. _____

Book No. _____

Accession No. _____

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOURTH HISTORICAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB, LAHORE.

Monday, the 14th January, 1929.

THE Conference met at the Maynard Hall, Law College, at 10 A.M. on Monday, the 14th January, 1929.

The Vice-Chancellor of the Punjab University in opening the Conference said :

Ladies and Gentlemen,—I find it a very pleasing duty to declare open this Conference, the History Conference. This is, I believe, the fourth Historical Conference that we are having. The first one, I remember very well, being held in the University Buildings under the presidency of Mr. Ramsay Muir. I remember it was opened by the then Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Sir James Ewing, who, in his opening remarks, said something to the effect that history was the Cinderella of the subjects taught in the Universities in those days. As far back as at the end of 1913 or the beginning of 1914 it was supposed that any intelligent graduate in any subject could teach history if he had a few weeks' start of the students. That Conference led to some considerable changes in the organisation of the courses and, broadly speaking, I believe we have been working, more or less, in accordance with the recommendations of that Conference ever since. There was another one which Mr. Ramsay Muir also attended about three years later, which formed a sort of appendix to it, in which we discussed broadly, as far as my memory goes, one special problem, that of the Honours students, and the question of the two years' or three years' course and the combining of history with other subjects and so on. And the recommendations of that Conference were never carried out ; and one finds, I think, that there has remained, particularly in that part of the subject, certain element of dissatisfaction. We feel that in the higher teaching of history we have not yet arrived at a quite satisfactory or a permanent solution. There have

FOURTH HISTORICAL CONFERENCE OF

been criticisms from time to time. We feel, I think, that on the Science side we are turning out trained chemists who are welcomed all over India. I am not sure, some of us are not quite sure, that that is being done to the same extent on the arts side. In particular, are we training historians who are welcomed elsewhere ? Owing to this feeling that we require some more development, that we require to go a step further and that we are in need of good advice in this respect and a fresh impulse to historical studies, some of us were led to agitate for some years in the syndicate and elsewhere recommending that we should endeavour to obtain a historian of note from England to come here for a few months to advise us on these matters and, in particular, to preside over a Conference of History Teachers and others interested in the teaching of history. That, however, was not practicable owing to financial difficulties in which the University was placed up till now. But this year, owing to the assistance of the Government, we have been able to make such an arrangement and we have been able to induce Dr. Arthur Percival Newton, Rhodes Professor of Imperial History in the University of London, to come out to India and particularly to the Punjab and to help us during the course of four months. He is, I believe, already well known to many, if not to all of you, and will need no further introduction from me. And so I have great pleasure in calling on him to take the Chair and I hope the deliberations of this Conference would help us one step further in our development of this very important subject of the teaching of history. (*Cheers.*)

Dr. A. P. Newton.—“Mr. Vice-Chancellor, Ladies and Gentlemen,—It is with some feeling of trepidation that I take the Chair at a Conference consisting, naturally, of people who know much more of the University of the Punjab than I can pretend to do. In the course of the work that I propose for the Conference in the course of the next three mornings I am going to take refuge rather in generalities and in the experience of my own University of London, while leaving it to you to translate the ideas and apply the principles that have been laid down to your own circumstances.

It lies with you to suggest modifications in your practice that might seem practical and likely to make the study of history in this University more efficient. Generally speaking, I hope that we shall be very practical in our discussions. We are not dealing with philosophical matters ; we are not attempting to find out absolute truth. We shall be attempting to apply the lessons of experience to the practical circumstances of one particular University and of one particular group of students. I am afraid I have had a good deal to do with the drawing up of the programme of the Conference. It fell to me to write the first draft, although the Executive Committee to which it was presented made some modifications in it, and if you look down your programme, you will find that it is designed in quite a definite way. In the first place we put to ourselves the problem of what place does history occupy, what part does history play in education, why do we study History at all. That is our first subject this morning. Then, secondly, having granted that history should be studied—I hope we shall come to that conclusion—we have to see what relation it bears to the allied subjects and how they may be treated in relation to history. That discussion will be opened by Mr. Hervey at half past eleven this morning. To-morrow we pass on to work that out a little further by dealing with the content of the historical curriculum. Granted that history is to be taught, granted that it must bear a certain relation to the allied subjects, then what should be the content of the historical curriculum at the different stages? I do not think that in the first discussion to-morrow morning we shall deal with it in detail, but I propose to give something of my experience of the curriculum as we have it in the English Universities and some of the principles that govern the inclusion or exclusion of different subjects at particular stages in the curriculum. And then, at half past eleven, we proceed to discuss the application of these general ideas to the practical circumstances of your own University. That will afford an opportunity for revealing what are the special difficulties that have been found in the working out of your curriculum. That discussion will be opened by Mr. Sita Ram Kohli at half past eleven

to-morrow. Then, on Wednesday, we go to the next stage. Having granted that history must be taught, having granted that there must be certain parts of it included in the curriculum, that curriculum should certainly lead on, as the curriculum in any University subject must lead on, to historical investigation directed to the extension of the boundaries of the subject. On Wednesday morning we deal generally with the post-graduate work, the encouragement of historical investigation and the practical application of that to the circumstances of Lahore which possesses a very valuable series of Punjab records. In the second part of the morning at half past eleven, we shall consider 'The Punjab Records as Sources for Investigation by Post-Graduate Students.' The plan appears to me to be a properly constructed edifice where we pass naturally from one paper to another and it is not merely, as sometimes happens at these Conferences, a series of papers read by one person to his fellow-students. Not at all. It is a connected whole, and I hope that at the end, when the proceedings of the Conference are published, as we hope to have them published, they will provide the material for discussion over a very much longer period than the three days of this Conference.

Now, let us come to the subject that we have to deal with this morning—'The Place of History in Education.' Sixty years ago, as late as 1868, there was no organised History School in any English University. Ancient history was studied to some extent in connection with the teaching of the classics, but there was no systematic, organised study of modern history whatsoever. The History School in the University of Oxford was founded in 1874, the History Tripos in Cambridge in 1875, and it was not until the very end of the 19th century, as late as 1898 or 1899, that it was possible to take an Honours degree in history in the University of London. How do we account for this long neglect of the subject which to-day is included in every grade of education right through the primary up to the highest University standard? I think it is to be accounted for by the fact that we had no material,

or rather that we had no corpus of written works in suitable, impartial form for students to investigate. It was not until the results of the great historical investigators of the sixties and the seventies had been absorbed into English history that it was possible to provide students with the necessary mass of material on which they could undertake impartial and cool historical study. Prior to that time history had been taken as largely a matter of partisanship. The appeal was made to history in order to find out hard facts to throw at political adversaries. History was regarded in fact almost as a branch of political propaganda.

But in Germany at the same period, luckily this idea had been abandoned, and with the work of the great historians, Niebuhr, Mommsen, von Ranke and their fellows, an extraordinarily interesting change had taken place. Working on the history of the ancient world, Niebuhr, especially on that of Greece, and Mommsen, on that of Rome, had shown convincingly that history need not be merely the plaything of the political propagandist or an interesting branch of literature to amuse the reader in an idle moment, it need not be merely a part of literature in which moralists could find lessons to teach to their own age, but it might be just as scientific a study as philology or any branch of natural science. They proved that historical facts and movements could be dealt with in just the same calm, impartial temper and that it was possible to reveal the growth of peoples as living organisms. That was an enormous revelation to the world as a whole. Serious historical work on these lines had been done before, but in the hands of Mommsen, especially, that revelation was made to the world with enormous effect. Mommsen was doing his greatest work during the forties. And gradually from that time onwards his influence stretched to England and by the sixties perhaps the most influential man ever working in English history was embarking upon his task. That was William Stubbs. Working in the sixties of the 19th century on the same lines as those laid down by Mommsen and Niebuhr, Stubbs applied the exact canons of scholarship and criticism to English mediæval history,

and out of that English mediæval history he made a story that was obviously no partisan story, but a description of the growth of what was an organic whole.

About the same time or a little later another man began his life work. Samuel Rawson Gardiner, a historian of less eminent reputation in his own day than Stubbs but his equal in scholarship, took the very difficult story of the Stuart times which had been filled with controversy and bitterness for a couple of hundred years. Out of it by dint of application to the documents themselves, and not what men said about the documents, he told a story of vast and uncontroversial interest which showed how the nation had been growing, and how its life was carried on during that period of the Puritan Revolution. Working on the basis of what Stubbs and Gardiner and others had done, a third man, John Richard Green, not an investigator, but a most graphic and versatile writer, took the story and wove it into his '*Short History of the English People*.' That book was published in 1874 and it had a profound effect. It sold literally by the ton. It was the best seller, not for one reading season, but for three or four reading seasons, and to this day it is one of the most widely read of books. It showed the English people growing up from small beginnings to the position of power and authority in the world that it had at the beginning of the 19th century. Through the maze of facts which previously appeared to have no correlation whatsoever, but which Stubbs, Gardiner and their fellows had shown in relation one with another, Green takes his course with perfect clarity and distinctness, turning neither to the right nor to the left. With a style that flows so easily and with a charm that is extraordinarily interesting to the ordinary reader he revealed the nation growing up as an entity, and so put the crown upon the work that was necessary before history could enter into the educational curriculum. By 1880 when six years had hardly elapsed after the publication of Green's '*Short History of the English People*', and the establishment of the School of Modern History at Oxford, we find History beginning to enter into the

school examinations, and it was gradually raised in English schools from that position of inferiority, as the Vice-Chancellor called it. From being the Cinderella of subjects, History gradually rose until it became an essential part of most secondary school curricula, and at that stage it stayed, with very much the content that had been put into it in the early eighties, until the outbreak of the war. English history, especially English constitutional history, based on the work of Stubbs, was studied in considerable detail, but European history was never taken into account except when it came into contact with English history and the history of the world was never studied at all.

The war came and at once people began to ask questions. Almost without a warning the ordinary man in the street found himself in a critical and terrible position that was inexplicable to him. Only the historian could tell him how he had got there and to him he set a question which it was very difficult for the historian to answer. He said : 'You have been teaching me history now for something like 30 years. I thought I knew some history, and then I found myself landed in this terrible war without being able to grasp how it has come about, without in the least understanding what the movements have been which have resulted in this great cataclysm. What have you got to say about it ?' That was a very difficult question for the historian to answer. He had to confess that his curriculum as it had been working thirty years had been far too much directed to the history of our own country, and far too little to that of the world as a whole. Especially, far too little had been taught of European history which it is vital that a citizen should know if he is to go through the complex political position with understanding, and not merely blindfold. Hence there came about a very great searching of heart among the historians, a recasting of their curricula with a very much greater insistence upon the subject of European and world history than had ever been seen before.

Having set to work on this matter, having opened their minds to discuss the roots of their beliefs, the historians proposed a

similarly searching question to the leaders in each of the other subjects that formed part of the ordinary curriculum. The proposition was made to the people in other subjects that they should all attempt to justify their position in education and to explain why their subjects were taught in the schools. The appeal went out from the Historical association to each of the other associations—Classical, English, Modern Language and Mathematical Associations, and ultimately we all wrote down on paper our respective creeds—it took a great deal of discussion before we could get at these creeds ; and I am quite certain that I cannot possibly do you greater service in this matter than by reading to you the creed that was the unanimous production of the English historians in the year 1917. It is on record as our justification and it stands to-day as one which not only expresses truly and well the reasons why we teach history, but also gives guidance to us all as to how we should teach it. I believe that the more you look at it the more you will definitely and whole-heartedly adhere to it :—

‘ The value of historical training consists only in part in the information conveyed; it lies chiefly in the training of the pupil to see through the details the main lines of historical development, and to understand something of the conditions—social, political, moral, intellectual and economic—that have moulded the present. The study of history, moreover, provides valuable training in accurate reasoning, in the formation of thoughtful judgment and in the expression of results in a clear and attractive form. Throughout the curriculum these aims should be kept in view by the teachers, due regard being paid to the stage the pupils have reached.

“ The study of history should be approached through that of the political community in which the pupils live. It should be treated in relation to the history of the British Empire as a whole, the growth of which should form a more important part of the whole curriculum than it has done hitherto. The outlines of general history should be explained so as to make intelligible the development of civilisation and our relations with other peoples. It is advisable that in every grade of education—

both secondary and University--there should be study of recent History, especial care being taken to deal with events in an impartial and sober spirit.'

There you have the creed of the English historians. In the spirit of that creed we made various modifications in our previous curricula. Those curricula were not unsound. We took them up and examined them. They were none of them radically bad, but, owing to the fact that they had grown up somewhat haphazard without organised thought, we found that alterations had to be made here and there to shape them into a whole. I imagine that in your own University you are probably finding the same kind of thing. You may be satisfied on the whole with the lines on which you have been working hitherto, but there can be no institution which is perfect. From time to time it is necessary to make reforms. Those reforms need not be very drastic, they should not be more drastic than is really essential. There should be an economy of reform so long as the necessary results are attained.

In the subsequent discussion which is to take place on this subject, I propose to allot to the first two gentlemen whose names are on the paper, Pandit Siri Ram and Mr. Ball, ten minutes each for opening the subject. After that there will be five minutes allotted to each subsequent speaker. I am sure it is not a very great length of time, but we must afford opportunities for all points of view to be expressed. Those gentlemen who desire to take part in the discussion will be good enough to send up their names to me at once so that I may get them arranged that everybody may be called upon in turn.

The discussion is now open and Pandit Siri Ram will expound his subject."

Pandit Siri Ram.—“Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—The introduction of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms in India has resulted in the appearance of two much-abused terms in our vocabulary. One was rather unhappy in its birth; people cannot

agree even upon its spelling, let alone its interpretation—I mean *diarchy*. The other has been much bandied across the floors of our legislatures and our platforms ; and its neat phraseology has often captured popular imagination. I do not know who first used the term *nation-making departments* in connection with the transferred half of our provincial Governments, but I should like to thank him from the bottom of my heart for supplying me with a phrase in connection with to-day's discussion. For I maintain that history is the *nation-making* part of our educational curriculum. I would carry the simile further—though not to Homeric lengths—and declare that the place of history in our education is almost similar to the place of, say, education itself in the governmental work of the country. There may be some very important subjects which the mundane business of this world renders essential to the maintenance of society. Law and order has to be maintained if society as such is to live intact. But the value of such a life as the maintenance of law and order alone, for example, would secure for us would be almost nugatory if the educational part of a nation's programme be not adequately fulfilled. The same is the case with history in the educational economy of a nation. It is all very necessary that I should know that two and two make four ; it is of the highest importance that some among my neighbours should learn engineering of all sorts, that others should study medicine and some more agriculture ; but if the fruits of all these studies are to be truly garnered, it is necessary that all of us should be permeated with that spirit of civic responsibility which should come as a result of the study of history. For history is the story of human endeavour to live together; and one result of studying this story should be to inculcate in all of us a sense of responsibility to others. If history succeeds in achieving this end—and it should be the endeavour of all of us here to contribute towards such a result—it would amply justify its definition as a *nation-making* subject.

But for us here in India history ought to occupy a still worthier place in our education. we stand at the parting of the ways,

it seems. The old-world ideas are giving place to new, 'lest one good custom should corrupt the world.' At this time of fermentation we need be guided by the wisdom of the ages, and it is history alone that can supply us with that wisdom. Our problems to-day, political, social and economic, sometimes take such an acute turn that we at once rush on to the despairing belief that of all the people of the world in all ages we alone have been selected to be the target for fortune's tricks. At such moments of despair history extends its helping hand. Not only does it give the reassuring information that other people and other nations have passed through such times and faced such difficulties with success, but it also makes available for us all the experience and wisdom accumulated by the human race through its onward march.

Moreover history, as I understand it, is an interpretation of the past with a view to understand the present, and foresee, if possible, the future. The world, at least our world to-day in India, sometimes swarms with reformers who are prepared to 'rush in where angels fear to tread.' It is the function of history to discourage such rash adventurers by handicapping them with a knowledge of our limitations based on our past, as it is its function to encourage others by holding out to them the hopes of their ultimate success based on the righteousness of their mission.

Thus understood, history has an important role to play in our educational system. It has to impart to us here in India that public spirit which is England's best gift to the East and without which all civic life becomes a soulless thing. Furthermore, it has to keep us straight in our endeavours to reform ourselves to-day. By the partial introduction of self-governing institutions and the extension of the franchise the task of educating our masters, the voters, has fallen on our shoulders to-day, and the best education that we can give them should include such a dose of history as to make it possible for them to help in the making of a happier and a brighter India."

Mr. U. N. Ball.—“Sir,—To a Conference of teachers and educationists the subject for this discussion is, I consider, very broad and at the same time rather dull. To say to educationists that History has a place in the education of the present day is begging the whole question. We are already teaching History. But the real point of view which the President has touched upon is this, for what purpose do we teach history? I remember when as a child I was reading history, I had a dread of it because my teacher wanted me to commit to memory every sentence, nay, even every word, of the book; and even when I went up for my B.A. examination, I was not much enamoured of it, and really, when I was ready to specialise, I wanted to avoid history. If I was dragged into its study, it was not so much by the course of circumstances as by the necessity which impressed itself upon me for such a study in the education of the present day. When I turned to the discussions in the class-room, to the papers written by the students, I felt the necessity of a historical study more and more. When I read the newspapers or listened to lectures and public speeches, I felt it all the more. Many people talk of things without any sense of perspective, without any sense of the sequence of events. And as the President has opened with the creed of the English historians, I believe we in India should also form ourselves into a body of thoughtful educationists and try to find out the object for which we study History. There are two divergent views on the matter. One view is, as was pointed out by the President, for the purpose of political propaganda. And the other is simply to find out the truth. The question to be put is, do you want a training to find out the truth, or do you want to study for the purpose of political propaganda? In education I am sure we shall fall short of the ideal if we give up the incentive to study. Of course, truth we must find out as scientists. But in the field of physics, chemistry and other scientific subjects, they have got certain ideals before them. A scientist has got an opportunity to earn his livelihood. An economist also has his opportunities provided by the Government and the commercial

classes of the country. But what is the opening for the historian ? Is he simply to find out when this man was born and how many sons he had ? Is it enough for him to study the documents and rectify the errors of old writers ? If the finding of the truth working like the scientist, carrying on his researches in the laboratory, were to be the aim, many would be repelled and there would be no attraction except for a few. History has its own attractions. We are taught to balance our judgments, train ourselves for the broader life of the country, and it is this cultural aspect of the historical study that we must have in view. It gives a broader culture, a wider outlook and a sense of appreciation of the different factors which are working for the development of the nation. If we have this in view, we need not be wandering about. In all countries there must be very few who would sit for days together carrying on the investigation for truth, but the general run of students, the general body of thinkers, will not be so kept engaged. We educationists have to combine both these functions in our teaching and in our studies as well. We ought to find out the truth and at the same time we should make our studies really interesting for the students as well as ourselves. We find that the courses are provided without any kind of idea before us, and what we are giving the students and what we are trying to find out is simply the genealogical tables or the connection of events. That is not enough. We should explain events from the standpoint of national forces, the forces of political, social and economic history, all of which have to be co-ordinated. All our ideas we generally get from political history, the social and economic being absolutely ignored. Even the study of documents which open to us mines of information we are ignoring absolutely. We should have before us the objective of co-ordinating these factors which Buckle so well brings out in his introduction to the 'History of Civilization.' That is, I should say by the way, a book which attracted me to the study of history. For what does Buckle say ? He wants that history should be studied from the point of view of political history, social history as well as the history of other

sciences. Unless this is done the study is bound to be dull and uninteresting. If education be for the uplift of the people, for the widening of knowledge and for giving a clearer understanding to the intellect, the study of history should include all these aspects. Otherwise we find the spectacle of students taking up history not for the sake of any culture, but for easily getting their degrees at the University. We must remove that tendency on their part, and make the study of history really interesting and useful. It must be a training not only for citizenship, but also for future manhood ; in fact for national development in all its aspects. Manhood, culture, character—all these are the fruits of historical study. Bacon has said that history makes men wise; it makes much more. Unfortunately, here it is studied as affording an easier passport to the degree. Unless we change our view-point, our method of study as well as our method of teaching, we cannot really improve the subject, and our education will be lacking in something which we should be trying to find out."

Mr. N. C. Daruwala.—“ Mr. Chairman,—The gentleman who led the discussion to-day—I mean Pandit Siri Ram—said that much more time ought to be given to history. Since we are all interested in history, I think we may certainly agree to that, but personally I do not believe that merely giving a larger place to history or delivering a few more lectures is going to accomplish anything at all. Taking the primary schools, we find that the majority of the teachers are thoroughly ignorant of the subject. In secondary schools you will find the people a little better, but you will also find that most of them can give neither the proper inspiration nor proper guidance in the subject. I should have liked to see at this History Conference a good representation of the teachers of the Central Training College. If we really want to teach history properly, we ought to go to the root of the matter and try to see that our teachers are better trained and that the schools appoint better teachers. As has been rightly pointed out by the Vice-Chancellor, this subject is the Cinderella among the subjects of schools and colleges.

The next speaker, Mr. Ball, among other things, pointed out that we are at present thinking of manufacturing history teachers. When we have the attitude of historians only, we certainly think of history as a science, and not as an art. You, Sir, have referred to men like Mr. Green, who made history interesting, but you were cautious enough to add that he was not scientific in spirit. In that respect, even if we prefer Stubbs and Gardiner to men like Green and Lecky, who write extremely good English and are impartial historians, and men like Froude, who writes in very good style, but is constitutionally inaccurate—even Macaulay himself is inaccurate—one thing stands out about Green, Lecky, Froude and Macaulay. The whole lot of them were very painstaking and they made history interesting and graphic to us. They have done much more for History (so far as the people of this country are concerned) than either Stubbs or Gardiner, for only advanced students and Professors of History study Stubbs' 'Select Charters' or Gardiner's 'Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution' and documents of the Stuart period. I do believe that if history is going to be made interesting, especially at school, we shall have to find some *via media* between these artists on the one hand and the scientists on the other. In England at least it is done. Those of you who know Keating at Oxford and his books on history teaching and on history from original sources must know this. In the Edwards School at Oxford and the Perse Grammar and Higher Grade Schools at Cambridge this experiment has been tried. Schoolchildren of 12 or 13 are given documents and an attempt is made to have them manufacture History out of these documents. I do not understand why in India also we cannot do the like. Of course objections will be raised regarding the vernacular and also the medium of instruction for the examination. The documents in India will be in different languages—some in Persian, some in Urdu, Gujarati, Marathi, Sanskrit and other languages. It will be a difficult matter to interpret them in the schools. Even in good schools where English is taught on the right lines—I am afraid the majority of them teach English on

the wrong lines—even where it is taught on the right lines, such as the Elphinstone and New High Schools at Bombay and some of the Government schools in the Punjab, even there it would be very difficult sometimes to introduce real documents. As a matter of fact there are very few books on the subject. It seems to me that if this Conference is going to do any good, we ought to come to some definite conclusion regarding the place of history in education, and the methods of teaching history; and we should send our recommendations through the right channels. The primary objects should be mental gymnastics and a search after truth with an unbiassed mind. We must give students some training in research, some mental gymnastics, a historic sense and a civic sense. We must also appoint some sort of text-book committee to give suitable text-books to the students and the public. I think that unless better books are written and prescribed on their merit as suitable text-books, we shall only keep on having history as a subject which is primarily meant for mugging up and cramming, and this is not going to be got rid of by merely adding two or three hours a week to the time-table at school or college."

Mr. Ponsonby.—“I have only a very few words to add to the discussion. As a teacher of history, I feel that you and I and all of us here have got a tremendous weapon in our hands. As teachers of history, we have an opportunity to guide the minds of young men who are placed in our hands, and the guidance may be of the right kind or the wrong kind. I have taught history in two colleges for thirty years : during the first fifteen years it was mere preparation of students for the various examinations, but in the latter fifteen years I see that it is not a matter of examination, but it is a matter of training of the mind to sane and sound reasoning. Young men have ideas now which they did not have before. The political world is a reality now, but this was not so thirty years ago. One who is a teacher has in the first place to be cautious to draw—I will not say ready to offer, for what is right to one is wrong to the

other—he must be cautious to draw sane and sound principles so that he may be able to train young men with a view to enable them to take their position as leaders when they grow up. That is my plea, that is what Providence has given to us who are teachers of history in schools and colleges, the opportunity of training young men. Our present-day responsibilities and dangers are therefore much greater than they were 30 years ago."

Mr. Kahan Chand.—“Sir,—I have just to ask two questions in connection with the opening speech that you made. To what extent, if at all, do the particular circumstances of a country determine what aspect of history shall be found more profitable for the time being in the education of its youth? Take, for example, England—England, as we all know, is an Imperial country and she is in the front rank of all the countries in the world. She has to keep in mind the diplomatic character of her history; she has got to do that much more than any other smaller and less distinguished country. Another country which has not yet come into line with other countries may find it more useful to study, and perhaps concentrate upon, her actual internal problems as well as to devote her attention to world problems in order to determine her position in the world. This cannot evidently be done unless social, economic and political history is intelligently studied. So internal history in all its aspects may be at one stage or another considered by a country more important for it than external history connecting it with its neighbours or with the world at large.

The other question is, to what extent can history be regarded as a useful and interesting literary subject—I mean the old theme, how can the reading of history aid the study of literature?”

Lieutenant-Colonel H.L.O. Garrett.—“I had not intended to speak at this stage, but the line the discussion has taken leads me to my feet. The particular aspect of teaching history in the Punjab is an old theme of mine. We have had mentioned in the course of the discussions this morning something about the

history of other nations, where it affects one's own. I feel that there is a great tendency to-day to teach history in water-tight compartments and that no attempt is made to co-ordinate and compare. That is one of the reasons why junior students find the history of other countries dull and uninteresting because there is no attempt to impress the facts on their mind by some form of comparison. I can give a very simple example of what I mean. Any of us teaching English history to a junior class would come across the Domesday Book. Now to an average Punjabi boy it is not very interesting. He simply knows the fact that William the Conqueror had a survey made which was embodied in the Domesday Book and the boy wishes that that fact may come in the examination so that he may answer the same. To make this more interesting you can push it a little further. You can make the Domesday Book more interesting to that boy if you tell him that in his own country of the Punjab precisely the same thing took place in 1849 when the British annexed the country. When the Punjab came into British hands, they wanted to know how much the Province was worth and so for that purpose they had a survey and settlement made for the purpose of arriving at the exact amount of revenue they could derive. Now when William the Conqueror conquered England, he wanted to know precisely the same thing, that is, how much revenue would England fetch him; and so in 1087 he had this survey made and it was embodied in the Domesday Book. If you teach in that way, the idea will take a tremendous hold on the boy and he will remember it. So in studying English history you can bring in things relating to India by comparison. I am certain that if that method of comparative study is pursued more than it is at present done, our history would be much more effective, much more interesting and much more educative than it is now."

Dr. A.P. Newton.—"The contributions so far made have been extremely interesting, but I do not know that there is anything that I can appropriately add to what has been said already. What I have to say is really almost an extension of what I was saying pre-

viously in a more general fashion. The point that Mr. Ball brought out was to me of first-rate and outstanding importance. History is a side of education which has no monetary value to the students. Of course some of the students prepare themselves to become professors and teachers in schools and colleges, but we can put them on one side. To the ordinary student, history has no vocational value at all and it is a remarkably good thing that it has none. We ought to be very proud of the fact that our subject is one that, because it has no vocational value, has infinitely greater civic value. It is the only subject by which a man places himself in relation to his environment. The dumb animals know no history, and that is why they are dumb animals. Man knows history, and man is man because he remembers. The memory of the community, the communal remembrance, if you can put it that way, gives us our history, and whether you like it or not, whether history is a good subject or a bad one, if you will only look back to the past, you will find that in all ages it has attracted the interest of mankind. Even the primitive savage sings his storied songs round the camp-fire in the evening, he tells about the glories of the past, about the great heroes who have led the tribe in earlier centuries. What our history has to do is something more elevating than the songs sung by the savage round the camp-fire. Needless to say that it is infinitely more subtle and complex because our civilisation is more complex. But just as those savage songs were all hung upon a theme, so also our history must be hung upon a theme. The theme of the savage was the glorification of the ancestors of the tribe ; the theme with which our history has to do is a much more sober and solid sort of thing than that. It is a study of the growth of the human community, the growth of the community to which we belong, the growth of the nation, of a group of nations, of the Empire and the growth of all modern nations in the scale of civilisation.

It is only the necessities of time and space that lead us to confine our historial enquiries within definite limits. A little while ago those limits were set rigidly to include only political and con-

stitutional matters, and the historian hardly concerned himself with anything outside. Luckily those limits have been relaxed and to-day, as was said by one of the speakers, we study appropriately something of the development of the economic structure, the social structure as well as the development of the political structure. Our history, instead of being in the flat, is coming gradually to be round, and we are beginning to see more sides of it. Here is the way in which we can make our history infinitely more interesting to our pupils, infinitely more interesting to boys and girls and to the undergraduates of the University. Mr. Garrett very rightly pointed out that by the method of comparison a good deal can be done, for instance, to bring the Domesday Book within the realm of practical understanding, and by bringing it into contact with the every-day life of the students you can do much to help them. So also in all other parts of the subject.

The contents of the historical curriculum must be designed in such a way that it is of direct service to the students, in that it fulfils its civic purpose, and trains the student to look with a sane and sound intelligence on the kind of problems with which it is likely he will have to deal as a citizen. If you are to convert the members of your community from merely obedient subjects into good and active citizens, it is essential that you shall train them to be citizens. Now the task of a historian, and here I am referring to what Pandit Siri Ram said—the task of a historian is so responsible a task that it is almost a task for which he requires a vocation. If a historian merely allows himself to be dragged at the heels of any party, whatever party that may be, whether political, religious or communal, if he allows himself to be dragged by the heels of that party as a mere provider of pseudo-history for political speeches, as a propagandist supplier of garbled information, providing material that is suitable for the purpose of the party, then he is committing an intellectual sin of the most disgraceful sort. As a private individual, he may do what he likes in the matter of politics, but as a historian, it is his business to give his approximation to the truth as nearly as he can get it. He can never get at the absolute

truth—none of us can, for it is far too many-sided, but we can reach a respectable approximation, which after all is only what a physicist gets even in his most accurate and refined measurements of non-living matter. It is the duty of the historian, as the one person specially commissioned to do so, to attempt to see these things as a whole, and to see them from all sides, because his business is to provide reliable information as to the past. Let other people interpret that information as they like. The historian's one and only theme is not the glorification of the nation or of a class or of a church or whatever it may be, but the extension of knowledge concerning the growth of the human organism that we call society. The human community is the highest form of living organism upon the earth. Just as the zoologist examines the growth of animal organisms, just as the botanist the organism of the plant, so the historian with the same cool temper and with the same scientific spirit ought to examine the growth of the human community, to trace it out in all its manifold ramifications as far as he can and give his results coolly and impartially so that they will command the general assent of all. The extraordinary thing about it is that if a historian will do that work in a cool and impartial spirit, he will be recognised on all hands as doing a service to the nation. Samuel Rawson Gardiner, who was my predecessor as a teacher of history in my own college, is the man to whom I have always looked up as an ideal in this matter. Working, as I said in my earlier speech, in the most controversial of subjects, a subject about which controversy had gone on for over two hundred years, he produced conclusions concerning it which are accepted by everybody. Those conclusions are interpreted differently. They are applied to different uses according to a man's political temper, but nobody denies Gardiner's sincerity, and everyone trusts in the accuracy of Gardiner's reconstruction of his period. That, it seems to me, is the ideal task of the historian. As historian, he has nothing to do with his likes or dislikes as a private individual. He has his professional task only as a trustworthy guide through the mazes of the past.

Let us remember another point, the point that came up in one of the speeches. So long as you are merely recounting facts as accurately and as decisively as you can, you are not getting any history, you are only beginning to get the materials out of which history must be made. But when you can find the correlations of these facts, and their association with the governing idea, their connection with the theme, so only do you begin to get history. When research students begin to select facts to squeeze some history out of them, before they know where they are history will be taking hold of them and it will be beginning to take shape along a particular path. I know that it is impossible for all historical students to undertake the study of original documents, but I think that every candidate for history Honours ought to undertake the study of the books he has to deal with in something of the same spirit of enquiry that must inspire an investigator. When students have to explore the documents contained in their books, I hope they will handle them with the critical temper of a historian who is engaged in research, for after all they are as new to them as his materials are to him. Whether your pupils are in secondary schools or intermediate colleges or in the higher classes of the University, if you can only get into their heads that they are studying history because they are living in history, and that the past and the present is one indivisible whole, then what you will do will be the right kind of historical study. If you can only make them feel that in the history lessons they are not in the stage of pupils merely having to imbibe the ideas of others, but that they are standing on their feet as individuals and have a share in what they are studying and are living in what they are studying, then you will find that the historical interest will be aroused to such an extent that it will be hard indeed to crush it out in after-life.

To-day in our English Universities history teaching has ceased to be merely the inpouring of certain doctrines and certain facts, and this change has also come about in all our best English schools. History is now, perhaps, the most interesting lesson throughout the whole school. It is a popular subject in England

to-day simply because it is a live subject, and it has become a live subject because we have come to believe that it is necessary for every citizen to realise where he stands in relation to the community as a whole. It is only through the study of history and its allied subjects that you can train up men to be fit to govern as well as to be governed. They may never make a penny out of it, but they will make a life out of it. After all, whether we make a penny or we do not, we all of us according to our station do make history. History is and ought to be a living subject, and if you can implant in your students the feeling that it is a living subject and that they are taking part in the succession of events that are described in their lessons, I think, for my own part, that you will find that those students take such an interest in their work as was entirely foreign to the lessons when they were duller and merely directed to the imparting of facts and information."

The Conference then adjourned for a quarter of an hour and reassembled at 11-40.

THE RELATION OF HISTORY TO ALLIED SUBJECTS.

Mr. A.C.C. Hervey.—“I happened to have sent to me as a Christmas present, and to read during the Christmas holidays, a remarkable book called ‘The Christ of the Indian Road.’ In this book the author says—I forget the exact words—that Christ should not be considered as having introduced a new religion, or brought a religion into the world. Rather he *is* religion. So, when I first saw our Conference programme, the first thing that came to my mind when I read the title of the first page ‘The Place of History in Education’, was, that History *is* Education. And the second thing was that the title of the paper which I now have the honour to read to you, should rather have been ‘The Relation of Allied Subjects to History ;’ and that the subject allotted to me to introduce is practically the same subject, or an extension of the subject, which we have just been discussing. Hence, doubtless, its place in the programme.

We are all familiar with the dictum that 'History is past Politics, and Politics is History in the making.' But political history is only one branch of history. History is also past Economics, and Economics is History in the making. I will go further and claim that history is, or contains, past geography, geology, biology and psychology, as well as past art and religion. In short, I doubt if there is any subject, academic or practical, which can be fully apprehended without some study of history. History is the key or master-subject which provides one basis for, and holds together, all education and organised society.

Two books, at the time of their publication eight or ten years ago, impressed me greatly with their views on the subject under discussion this morning. I accordingly turned to them again at this juncture, to test, as it were, the views expressed above. H. G. Wells, in his introduction to the 'Outline of History', writes, "This Outline deals with ages and races and nations, where the ordinary history deals with reigns and pedigrees and campaigns ; but it will not be found to be more crowded with names and dates, nor more difficult to follow and understand. History is no exception among the sciences; as the gaps fill in, the outline simplifies; as the outlook broadens, the clustering multitude of details dissolves into general laws, and many topics of quite primary interest to mankind, the first appearance and the growth of scientific knowledge, for example, and its effect upon human life, the elaboration of the ideas of money and credit, or the story of the origin and spread and influence of Christianity, which must be treated fragmentarily or by elaborate digressions in any partial history, arise and flow completely and naturally in one general record of the world in which we live." And again, "It is one experimental, contribution to a great and urgently necessary educational reformation, which must ultimately restore universal history, revised, corrected and brought up to date, to its proper place and use as the backbone of a general education. We say, 'restore,' because all the great cultures of the world hitherto, Judaism and Christianity in the Bible, Islam in the Koran, have used some

sort of cosmogony and world history as a basis. It may indeed be argued that without such a basis any really binding culture of men is inconceivable. Without it we are a chaos.' Here he refers to 'an excellent pamphlet by F. J. Gould, 'History, the Supreme Subject in the Instruction of the Young.'

Turning from the view of an amateur to that of a professional historian, F. S. Marvin writes in the preface to 'The Living Past': 'The clue which this little book follows is no new discovery. It first came clearly into view with Kant and the philosophers of the eighteenth century. Take Kant's Theory of Universal History as the growth of a world community, reconciling the freedom of individuals and of individual states with the accomplishment of a common aim for mankind as a whole. Add to this the rising power of science as a collective and binding force which the century since Kant has made supreme. You have then one strong clear clue which, with the necessary qualifications, seems to offer in the field of history something of the guidance and system which Newtonian gravitation gave to celestial mechanics in the seventeenth century. The growth of a common humanity: this is the primary object to keep in view. But it will prove vague and inconclusive unless we add to it a content in growth of organised knowledge, applied to social ends.'

These are the kind of views which compel conviction. Coming upon them for the first time, one feels like Keats on first looking into Chapman's 'Homer'; or like stout Cortez 'silent, upon a peak in Darien.'

It so happened that almost the first thing I came across, after committing myself to the writing of this paper, was the presidential address at the recent annual session of the Indian Economic Conference. I therefore determined to read it from the point of view of testing my thesis again, and discovering whether Professor V. G. Kale would or would not provide me with further evidence and support. Here is the result; 'Though economics

must not tread on the domains of sociology and politics, it cannot ignore the intimate relation of these two to itself and the influence of social and political conditions upon economic life.' And further on he quotes the Royal Commission on Agriculture: 'The demand for a better life can, in our opinion, be stimulated only by a deliberate and concerted effort to impress the general conditions of the countryside, and we have no hesitation in affirming that the responsibility for initiating the steps required to effect this improvement rests with Government.' The report proceeds to state that 'the failure to grasp the full significance of this proposition explains the absence of any co-ordinated effort to effect the required change in the surroundings and the psychology of the peasant without which there can be no hope of substantially raising his standard of living.' What is this but to say that agriculture and the well-being of all India are intimately bound up with psychology and economics, and the latter in turn with politics and sociology, *i.e.*, with history in its true and wider sense.

Now to relate all this with actual conditions and educational curricula. This would fall under two heads. Firstly, World History as the basis of general education for all students, 'Arts and Science' alike. Or rather Universal History, from the beginning of all things, as in Mr. Wells' Outline. This, as has already been indicated, would be a task of impossible magnitude. It would include something of all the sciences and show their place in the general scheme of things. It would be the history of thought as well as of action. It should be impossible for anyone to be educated up to the age of 21 or 22 to get perhaps even high degrees and academic titles, and yet be ignorant of the meaning and significance of the theory of evolution, of the importance of the study of psychology to the modern world, of comparative religion, of the structure of the universe, of the essential features of the world's greatest philosophers and scientists. In India of all countries these things cannot be left to chance. This ignorance of the majority of the Punjab University students in these and kindred matters is appalling. It seems

amazing that the necessity for the study of universal history as the basis for higher education has not yet been adequately realised in India or in the world as a whole. The world is one, and history is the record of how it has come to be what it is, and the key to its further progress.

Secondly, and lastly, what is the relation of the argument to the curriculum of different 'subjects,' with special reference to the University of the Punjab? We have a tendency to study 'subjects' divorced from their context, which is civilisation, the environment in which we live. History relates all subjects to life. The necessity for a historical treatment in political economy and in political science is, I think, not sufficiently realised and practised. The same may perhaps be said of the necessity for not regarding history, as a 'subject,' as merely political history. But I think the criticism is most applicable to our study of languages. I suggest, for instance, that our study of English is still far too literary, too much literature for literature's sake. We have at last partly realised that eighteenth century essayists and their lives as portrayed in that incredibly dull series the 'English Men of Letters' are not the best medium for teaching our intermediate and undergraduate students familiarity with the modern English language for practical purposes or even for creating in them interest in a living literature. But it does not seem that we have yet done enough. Apparently, as regards languages at any rate, the theory still holds the field that it is not fair to include books, whatever their literary value, if they have some historical value too, on the ground that it is not fair to introduce into the course or examination on one 'subject' anything which appertains to another 'subject.' This water-tight compartment system, as far as it still survives, must be removed by the infusion everywhere of history in the sense in which it has been used in this paper. This is necessary not only for national citizenship—and vitally so for India at this crisis in her history—and not only for world citizenship, but also to put each subject in its proper perspective.

The same applies to other language subjects. For instance, in our courses of Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit, there is little or no attempt to teach the literature as a means to any end other than the further study of pure literature. The essays set are invariably 'on a subject connected with the Arabic, Persian or Sanskrit Literature or Language,' never with their history or civilisation. In Hebrew it is on some theme connected with the language, literature or history of the Hebrews, which is better, except that there are here no students of Hebrew.

The Board of Examiners for the principal Civil Services of the British Empire, including the Indian Civil Service, requires that a candidate who offers a language as a subject shall also offer the civilisation of which that language is the medium of expression. I suggest that we might follow this lead, and study not 'subjects' by compartments, but civilisations, or civilisation as a whole. The lead towards this reform must come from the teachers of our subject, History."

Dr. A. P. Newton.—"In the discussion that has to follow I hope attention may be directed, if I may so suggest, to the latter part of Mr. Hervey's paper. I think we are all agreed that Mr. Hervey has proved his point in the first half of the paper that history must be many-sided and that it must be infused, wherever infusion is practicable, with economics, geography and so forth. We can take that for granted. But here are the hard, practical questions to us as people concerned with the University. To what extent is that infusion possible? To what extent will the teachers, let us say of Economics and English—which are the two subjects we are most concerned with—listen to our requirements? To what extent will they work in common with the history department? Can anyone here draw lessons from their experience of their contacts with the professors of other subjects? Are there any modifications of University arrangements which can be suggested? If satisfactory answers to these questions can be given, you will see that we shall be giving practical aid upon the point

that we shall be discussing to-morrow morning, that is, 'The Content of the Historical Curriculum.'

I do not want to bind the gentlemen who are to open the discussion and I shall be glad if they will regard themselves as entirely free. But in the subsequent discussions, as far as possible, I hope that we shall direct our attention to the hard, practical points, to the actual means of applying the principles on which we are all agreed."

Mr. N. C. Daruwala.—“Sir,—I find to some extent that Mr. Hervey has anticipated me. I prepared my paper last night just as Mr. Hervey did his and I am sorry we were not able to co-ordinate our efforts. Perhaps it would be difficult to co-ordinate our papers as we have worked on different lines, although the fundamental proposition that all these subjects are allied is granted by both of us. I will first of all refer to the point touched on by Mr. Hervey about world history as given in Keatinge, Hearnshaw or even H. G. Wells. We get plenty of opportunities in England in the schools to tell children of twelve years and under something about world history and world geography in story form. Books of the type of Hearnshaw or Keatinge are often used. I do not know how far such books are suitable for Indian schools. Another point is that the text-books should be written in the vernacular so that the students may find the subject not too difficult, may cover more ground quicker, and thus the horizon of the boys will be widened.

Then there is reference to too much of English literature being taught. I think Mr. Hervey is perfectly right there. Although as a Professor of English I may have a bias in favour of literature, and I do believe that a certain amount of literature, especially modern literature, is a very important part of education, I think the chief fault lies in prescribing too much literature and too many books. It seems to me that by prescribing too many books, English is lowered in standard and the English professors do not get enough time to teach the fundamentals of the language to the students under their charge. You will find that in the B.A.

course there are several books of essays and one is a novel. But we can easily find some books through which we can teach history as well as literature. For example, while teaching Froude, Macaulay or Carlyle, we may try to show how far Froude is 'constitutionally inaccurate,' and what allowance to make for the temperament, literary style or exaggerations of Macaulay and Carlyle. In recent times books have been published which are historical in their content and in style. I do not exactly know what Mr. Hervey means, whether he wants actual works on history to be prescribed for English courses. Personally, I believe that for all the lower work, including the B.A. pass course, if the same man teaches history and English, he can simplify matters by giving a historical background where it is necessary. I think it would be better if he knows economics also because in the pass course the subject prescribed can be better dealt with by an economist. In English schools we often find the same man teaching history, English and geography or civics.

Then again, the history of civilisation ought to be studied. I think no other subject will treat of progress and civilisation so well as history—something about Syria, Babylon and Egypt as well as the modern civilised world. We come across so many classical allusions in poets like Keats or Byron, Shakespeare or Milton, that we find it necessary to know something of the civilisation of Greece and Rome—at least simple stories about these countries. Even to this day many of our teachers do not know much about the social and political institutions of England. They are not always able to deal with the subject. Some of them pursue English only as a written language, and know the English language perhaps as it was written in the eighteenth century, and are ignorant of modern works.

History and Allied Subjects.—In a sense there is a unity in learning. All knowledge is one. And all history is one. The unity of history has been sufficiently emphasised, and rightly emphasised, by Arnold in his 'Lectures on

'Modern History,' by Freeman in his 'Comparative Politics,' by Seeley in his 'Introduction to Political Science' and by Lord Acton in 'A Lecture on the Study of History.' H. G. Wells, Hearnshaw and other writers of world history trace—or try to trace—the history of the world from the beginning of the world to the present time in a fascinating, though scrappy, manner.

Any division of knowledge into water-tight compartments is an evil—perhaps a necessary evil. Such division is merely for the convenience of man, whose brain cannot encompass all branches of learning. Nor was this division always made. There was a time when thinkers and writers like Plato, Aristotle and Quintilian, and educationists of the Renaissance period like Vittorino de Feltre, Guarino de Verona, Leo Battista Alberti and others realised the full significance of the unity of knowledge, and, what is more, excelled in most of the various branches of learning. The ideal of Vittorino was high and largely borrowed from Quintilian's idea of the 'Education of the Orator.' An educated man had to be a sort of versatile genius in all branches of learning as well as an orator. Leo Battista Alberti was one such genius in an era of versatile geniuses.

History, Geography and Economics.—The close connection between history, geography and economics is recognised by all. But it is one thing to see or to profess that we see, this connection; it is another to take definite action to compel ourselves or our students to regard these three as cognate subjects, and, wherever advisable, to study them together. If, as Marshall says, 'Economics is a study of mankind in the ordinary business of life,' and if it is its business to collect facts, to arrange and interpret them and to draw inferences from them, then surely history in general, and economics and social history in particular, can greatly help the economist. Geography, though not invariably, usually helps us in understanding the history of a country. Mr. M. M. Chatterji in his book on 'History as a Science' refers to 'the lack of synchronism between great historical and geographical changes. No considerable change in

the geography of Greece has taken place from the time she gave birth to the civilisation of Europe, and yet what a change in her history.' But surely, such a thing can be said of Egypt, India, Persia, Assyria, Rome and Carthage too! But Mr. Chatterji, as well as most modern historians, correlate the two subjects and give geographical chapters in historical works.

If history, geography and economics are three sisters, civics, political science, the history of political philosophy, the history of education and the history of literature and art are just half-sisters, belonging to the same large family of social science. Modern writers from Green and Lecky to H. G. Wells and—shall I say?—Dr. Newton acknowledge this connection. How to reconcile the conflicting claims of all these subjects, how to select or write text-books, how to work in important subjects like civics and stories from world history at school, and literary, social or educational history at college, I leave to boards of studies, syndicates and school boards of Universities and to the gentlemen who are going to discuss 'The History Curriculum at Various Stages' at this Conference.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS.

History and Political Science.—'Politics,' says Sir John Seeley, 'are vulgar when they are not liberalised by history, and history fades into mere literature when it loses sight of its relation to practical politics.' In one sense this is quite true. For, as Lord Acton says in 'A Lecture on the Study of History,' 'The science of politics is the one science that is deposited by the stream of history like grains of gold in the sand of a river.'

What Lord Acton has done to show the unity of modern history Freeman has done to show the unity of ancient and mediæval history. 'A knowledge of the history of Greece is imperfect without a knowledge of the history of England' and *vice versa*. 'Out of the union of Roman and Teutonic elements arose the modern world of Europe.'

As regards a study of political institutions, the comparative and historical method is so important that it is invariably adopted in all the higher examinations of the various Universities. Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Bluntschli, Woodrow Wilson, Lowell, Bryce, Seeley, Graham, Marriott, Freeman and Ogg are the great writers on the subject, and almost all of them have made great use of the comparative and historical method. The problems of constitutional history can so easily be mastered by a good grasp of comparative politics, and the study of comparative politics can be so simplified by a study of constitutional history, that I believe in both the subjects being compulsorily correlated and taught together in the B.A. and M.A. classes. As Sir John Seeley puts it : 'history without Political Science has no fruit ; Political Science without History has no root.'

History and the English Language and Literature.—'History,' says Shelley, 'is the cyclic poem written by Time upon the memories of men. The past, like an inspired rhapsodist, fills the theatre of everlasting generations with her harmony.'

This is why Mr. Green in his 'Short History of the English People' has 'devoted more space to Chaucer than to Cressy, to Caxton than to the petty strife of Yorkist and Lancastrian.'

According to Macaulay, himself a bit of a historian, the ideal historian 'considers no anecdote, no peculiarity of manner, no familiar saying, as too insignificant for his notice which is not too insignificant to illustrate the operation of laws, of religion and of education and to mark the progress of the human mind.'

Landor makes Pericles discourse, in the presence of Thucydides, on the duties of a historian : 'History,' says Pericles, 'when she has lost her muse, will lose her dignity, her occupation, her character, her name... Show me how great projects were executed, great advantages gained and great calamities averted. Place history on her rightful throne, and at the sides of her, Eloquence and War.' And Birrell, after attacking Morley and Seeley, says 'The Iliad, Shakespeare's Plays,' and, I may add, Macaulay, Burke

and Carlyle, 'have taught the world more than the politics of Aristotle or the Novum Organum of Bacon.'

Language is rooted in history. There is such a thing as the history of words and history of language, for language is a planet of slow and ceaseless growth. Every great book on the subject prescribed for higher examinations in English and Indian Universities adopts the historical method. If you do not know the main currents of English history well, you cannot understand either the history of language or the literature of England.

The main tendencies of English literature are hardly intelligible without a careful study of the general and social history of the period. English literature is full of allusions to ancient and modern history. A due study of the times of Edward III helps a study of Chaucer. Spenser is better understood, and the full allegorical significance of the 'Faerie Queen' comes home to our mind when we think of the history of the age of Queen Elizabeth. The transition from the Miracle Plays to the Elizabethan and Shakespearian Drama is also traceable historically. Even the various phases of the life of Shakespeare can be better understood when we study him in a historical spirit, as is done by Brandes, Dowden and others. The Restoration comedy and the flippant and profligate literature of the times owe much to the personality of the 'Merry Monarch, who never said a foolish thing, nor ever did a wise one.' It was the history of the times which produced the 'Tatler' and 'Spectator' of Steele and Addison; the writings of Defoe, Swift, Richardson, Fielding, Smollett and Sterne, and the novels of Scott, Dickens and Thackeray.

And where would the Romantic Revival movement in English poetry have been without the Age of Reason and the Era of the French Revolution? 'L'esprit de Lois,' Rousseau's 'De Contrat Social,' the books and pamphlets of Voltaire and the work of the Encyclopœdistes form a huge mass of literature in itself. Burke, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley and Keats are all influenced by the Revolutionary and the Napoleonic Era. Burke's "Reflec-

tions on the French Revolution,' many of the important sonnets and short pieces of Wordsworth during the decade 1796 to 1806, 'A Tale of Two Cities,' Carlyle's volumes on the 'French Revolution,' all are inspired by this volcanic era. The French influence on the English literature of this period is paramount. Soon German influences also begin to play their part in English Romanticism.

Even the best of the modern writers are children of their times. The world has grown smaller—distance is greatly reduced by modern inventions, including the railway and steamship. Writers of one country influence those of other countries as they hardly ever did before. Short stories, essays, novels, problem-plays and poems are read by all.

History and Civics.—If any part of history, economics, politics, geography and literature is useful enough for every-day purposes for every man or woman without being too learned, theoretical or dull, it is civics. Education for citizenship is greatly emphasised by Dr. G. Kerschensteiner of Munich in his classical work on 'Continuation and Trade Schools.' Education for citizenship and education for service is the crying need of India to-day. Scouting will aid citizenship, as it will help the right ideal of a League of Nations, by emphasising the ideal of the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God."

Mr. A. M. Dalaya.—“When Dr. Newton was last at Peshawar, I asked him what they were going to do at the History Conference. He replied: ‘Young man, I am going to prepare a dog-fight for you.’ This answer startled me. I was still more startled to hear that I was not merely to watch a dog-fight, but to participate in it. I am glad, however, that I am the last speaker for this morning: the very want of time gives me to hope that I may escape a mauling. I want to discuss this subject under three heads. The first is, how a teacher of English literature can be helpful to a teacher of history and *vice versa*; the second concerns the

advantages to be secured by teaching history alongside the allied subjects ; and the third has to do with method.

Mr. Daruwala has given you a long list of books and some suggestions as to how history and literature can be combined. I do not want to go into any abstract theories about it. I want to place some facts before you. If you look at the curriculum of English studies, you will find that the texts that are prescribed for the English course come within the period of the 16th to 19th centuries. Now, if you will look at the 16th and 17th centuries, three important facts stand out on the canvas of history : the Renaissance, the Spirit of Patriotism and Discovery and Exploration. All three of them are amply reflected in Shakespeare and his contemporaries. The spirit of the Renaissance you will find in 'As You Like It,' in references to Troilus and Cressida and Hero and Leander and other classical allusions. The Spirit of Patriotism you will find brought out in Richard II where Gaunt apostrophises England thus :

' This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of Majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise,
This fortress built by nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of War.'

And for discovery and exploration you turn to Hakluyt's ' Voyages of Elizabethan Seamen.' My point is that a teacher of history can render valuable aid to the student of literature by revealing to him the history underlying and implicit in that literature. In the same way I might deal with the relationship of history and economics ; but I shall content myself with a brief account of how it is done at Oxford.

For the History School at Oxford a candidate has to study the whole of the political history of England, the whole of the constitutional history of England, the whole of the economic history of England and the political philosophies of Aristotle, Hobbes, Rousseau and Mill. If you ask me where literature comes in, I will tell you that there are twenty-four questions asked in

the political history paper ; the candidate is supposed to answer four. That sounds rather humorous to the Indian University man. It is bereft of humour to the man at Oxford because it does not give him any greater choice than the six questions out of twelve do the Punjab University man with the advantage at Oxford that it enables a candidate to study any feature of history that he is most interested in. All he has to do is to focus his attention on the literary side of history or the colonial side or the voyage period or any other phase, and he is sure to find questions touching on all these phases in the paper. He reads that particular portion thoroughly, and when he goes to the examination, he attempts only those of the twenty-four questions for which his special reading has prepared him. My next query is : What are the advantages of studying two or more subjects together, history and English literature, for instance ? Firstly, it will aid to a better understanding of both subjects ; for the literary aspects of his historical period, the professor of English literature will be his guide ; and for the historical background of the literature he is studying, he will go to the professor of history.

The second advantage is that it gives to the student the opportunity to study what he really likes. I recall a student who, having taken up history at Oxford, wanted later to change to another subject because he did not like history. It was too late in the year to do this, but the difficulty was met by allowing him to switch on to the literary side of history, with the result that he was quite happy. There you have a concrete example of a man studying exactly what he likes.

The third advantage is that it becomes far more interesting and it lasts in the memory far longer. An Indian student at Oxford has to do More's 'Utopia' and Bacon's 'Essays' instead of Latin. It is a pleasant surprise to the Indian student, who is not taught to study things together at home, to find that in a history lecture the professor refers to the autocracy of Henry VIII as being

best depicted in More's 'Utopia.' In that way both history and literature dovetail into each other, and it is very helpful to the student. Then it will probably help one professor to lighten the burden of another professor ; and finally it will help the student of history who has studied history as a whole, and not merely the political part or merely the skeleton of it, to talk in after-life on all features of his subject.

The last point is, what is the practical method ? Here I am treading on dangerous ground. I merely suggest that, instead of prescribing twelve questions, you give us what we have at Oxford, that is, twenty-four questions, ranging over various phases of the period. Let the student study what he is most interested in, and, what is more, let the professor teach what he is most master of."

Dr. A. P. Newton.—"Before I throw the subject open for general discussion, I have to direct your attention to the practical point, that is, what is the actual relation between our history and English teaching ? I do not think it matters very much about economics or geography. The question of vital importance in your University seems to me to be this : what is the proper relation between teaching of English literature and the teaching of history ?"

Sardar Teja Singh.—"I will talk about two things : the relation of English to the subject of history ; and, later on, the relation of languages to the understanding of history—a subject which, I think, has been ignored in most of the speeches. When Mr. Hervey suggested that the English curriculum could be correlated with that of history, I was wondering whether it was possible to prescribe such courses in English literature as to have a direct bearing upon the teaching of particular syllabuses and particular texts, as, for example, the French Revolution. Would it not be possible to find texts of English literature which would have a direct bearing on that subject ? If we were teaching English history, would it not be possible to find such books as 'Westward Ho !' and Sir Walter Scott's novels bearing upon the particular periods which

we are teaching ? I think it is possible. But this question cannot be decided finally unless we first lay down what is the aim of teaching history. If the aim is to inculcate a particular culture to which history belongs, then perhaps we will have to look at it from a different point of view. The strange thing that I find in the Punjab is that we have not produced a historian among those who are well up in English. That is due to the fault of teaching western history. So far as Indian history is concerned, I find many of us do not know how to distinguish between the past and the present, which is the A B C of history. We find events occurring in one age confused with those of another age. We find Krita Yuga and Kali Yuga mixed up. We are told, for instance, that Guru Nanak and Bhartri Hari were contemporaries. Similarly we have several confusions, such as whether the Ramayana is mentioned in the Mahabharata, and *vice versa*. In India nothing is obsolete even in language. Certain words used 4,000 years ago are still current. Nothing is obsolete. History teaches us how to distinguish between age and age, and it is strange that we have not yet been able to use the knowledge and genius in the writing of history. We cannot expect from our students, or even from the mass of historians in India, that they should specialise in European or English history. The utmost that we should expect from Indian students is that they should do something for their own history. If therefore we define the ideal which we are to place before the students as being to secure their own culture and to devise a course of history in such a way as to help in realising that ideal, this will perhaps bring the thing to greater definiteness. Therefore, if we are to make this subject more productive, we must define our ideal. Unless our students specialise in classical languages also, there will be no useful study of Indian history. The study of classical languages is neglected at present, and those who write the history of our country do not know much of classical languages. This should set us seriously to thinking. With the exception of S. Muhammad Latif—who was an adept in classical languages—he too did not know much of English, but his

work, I believe, was translated for him by others—with this exception, no other historian in the Punjab knew much of the vernaculars or classical languages. Most of the books that appear about India relate to the Ancient Period. About the Middle Ages some people are found taking an interest. About the British Period we have only got the military records of Government. Not much interest is shown in that period. We can expect better results only if we take care to include the classics as a definite part of the history curriculum ; or, at least in the case of students who take up history, they must be made to take up some language ; not that they should have a smattering knowledge of that language, but that they should have a good grounding in that course. You must have books like the historical books in Persian by Abul Fazl, works like the 'Ain-i-Akbari.' Unless you read such books, you cannot have a good idea of the reign of Akbar. Similarly, with regard to Chandra Gupta, one must know something of 'Mudra Rakhshasa.' No attempt is being at present made to make history real. Besides this, the teaching of geography should be encouraged. Geography was not being taught in the Punjab until lately. We have only one geography of Ancient India which needs revision in the light of the researches of Sir John Marshall. It would be better if we do not emphasise too much the history of Europe, but pay special attention to Indian history. In the curriculum of the M.A. you will find the whole of Indian history from beginning to end prescribed. This merely encourages the neglect of the subject. In the case of English history, only particular periods are prescribed, but in the case of Indian history, we are whole-hoggers. We are not taking much interest in Indian history simply because we do not take it intensively, bit by bit. In the 18th century, for example, much material was produced which could be used in reconstructing the history of that period. If we want to make any change, we should proceed on these lines also. We should make a small beginning from the primary, and take it on to the entrance, standard. Recently history was included, but formerly a matriculation student could pass without knowing anything of history.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. L. O. Garrett.—I should like to say, on the point just raised, that this question of classical languages and its relation to history formed one subject at a previous History Conference. Then it was felt that where improvement was needed was not so much on the history side as on the side of the classical language. The Conference recommended that it was not the history house that should be set in order so much as the classical language house. It was suggested, for instance, that the M.A. Arabic and Persian courses might be much more adequate if a paper was introduced on Persian and Arabic history as the periods concerned were both literary and historical. So far as I know, that recommendation was sent by the Board of Studies to the Board of Studies for Persian and Arabic; and I believe it had the effect of getting them to modify their course of reading. It is important to remember that the earlier Conferences were not unmindful of this question. I think it might be extended still further on the classical side. Let history be taught in that faculty in the classical language, then you will have your school equipped for research in classical languages also."

Mr. Ponsonby.—“Till now, the discussion has been in the abstract. I will give you a concrete instance. For five years the Gordon Mission College was suffering from a lack of funds, and consequently the staff was short-handed. It will take your breath away if I tell you that I was appointed to teach history and English and economics in the B.A. classes, and I did it. I, myself, as well as the boys, had a very happy time. For instance, in reading a selection from Macaulay, I had all the material from the history side to help the students; and to understand the English, I had all the material on the English side. Similarly with economics also. I do not lay claim to all kinds of knowledge, but in this case, both the students and I benefited very largely. The college also was financially benefited. We are called upon as history teachers to teach economics in an indirect way, or, in teaching English, to teach history in an indirect way. That means that a

man who is a professor of history is expected to know not history only, but something more than that."

Dr. A. P. Newton.—“This practical question must be discussed in a body which is more comprehensive than this Conference can possibly be. We are all agreed on this point about the relation between the various subjects. After all, time is limited, and there are only a certain number of hours that a student has to work and only a certain number of questions can be asked in an examination paper. What is the practical translation into actual or practical politics of these principles on which we are all agreed ? I am inclined to think that it is not very profitable for us to discuss this matter now because we have not got the opposite party in court. My suggestion is that after this Conference is over at some time convenient to you within the University you should hold a practical small Conference between yourselves of the history department and those belonging to other appropriate departments. The department of English and other departments should be included, as well as the department of classical languages, suggested by Sardar Teja Singh. I think that gentleman was hitting the nail on the head very well indeed. Certainly, as regards the association of English literature with history, there ought to be some practical improvements within the various colleges of the University. A Conference of the teachers concerned ought to be able to work out a *modus vivendi* or actual way of arranging things so that you do not keep yourselves strictly in water-tight compartments, but share your work with others. Occasionally you might have history lectures in the literature classes, and history students would greatly benefit by knowing more of the literature of the periods they are studying. You should work more in conjunction of that kind, and it is a matter of practical working between the colleges and departments of the University. Do keep that in mind and discuss it with your colleagues, the English professors or the classical professors. Unless you know something of the life of a people and of the way in which that life developed, it is almost impossible to understand

their literature and the temper prevailing therein. On the other hand the literature of a period is the most easily accessible manifestation of the life of that period. If we study history solely from official documents, we get only a one-sided picture. To get at the real culture of the people and to get some side-light on their thoughts and actions you must read what the men of those times have said or written. Both ourselves and our colleagues on the literary side have to contribute something to decide upon what is the best course to pursue and it is essential that there shall be contact with each other while the discussion is taking place.

To sum up the whole discussion of this morning, I have found it most interesting and informing. I do not think there has been any waste of words. Generally speaking, we have been applying ourselves closely to the subject under discussion and, if we can proceed in that temper for two days, we shall have achieved a great deal. When our proceedings are published, I am certain they will be read with interest by all as reminding us of what took place in the discussion and providing a stimulus for future action.

The conference reassembled at ten o'clock on Tuesday, the 15th January, at Maynard Hall, with Dr. A. P. Newton in the Chair.

Dr. A. P. Newton.—This morning we have got to consider two subjects. For the first half of the morning the subject is "The Content of the Historical Curriculum" and for the second half, "The History Curriculum at Various Stages." For my part I do not think there is very much difference between these two subjects, and as a matter of fact, I do not propose to keep the discussion very close to the two parts of it. I merely suggest to you that after I have talked to you for a few minutes on the curriculum in other universities, you should generally devote your attention to the contents of the curriculum in the main without specially referring to details, and then in the second half you can discuss details. In my view and in the view of all English teachers

of history the essential and central part of the history curriculum is the curriculum for B.A. Honours, and I will begin at that point.

In our English Universities since the middle of the 19th century, it has been customary for the best students after they have entered upon the University course to specialise along certain lines of study. That has long been the custom, and in Oxford, for example, many students specialize in classic, ancient history and philosophy blended in a single subject in what is known as the "Greats" school. Similarly in Cambridge there has long been a distinguished school known as the Mathematical Tripos, and it is upon these two patterns that other schools have grown up. At one time it was the custom in Oxford to have a school of Modern History and Law, but that did not prove entirely satisfactory, although it was a very popular school and in the seventies that was split up into two schools—Law on the one hand and Modern History on the other. About the same time the Historical Tripos was founded in Cambridge. Students taking up these particular subjects devote their attention entirely to the various branches of history. That does not mean that they are taking a narrow course. Not at all. History is so wide that if you study it seriously on proper lines, you will find opportunities for training every part of a student's intellect. You can theorise in the history of political ideas; you can take up study of an extensive kind with broad sweeps of history over long periods and you can engage in intensive study in narrow portions of history. A proper combination of these types of training goes to make up the whole school. There can be no doubt that the work done in the history schools of great universities like Oxford, Cambridge, London and Manchester has proved satisfactory to many generations of students; and no course is more widely taken at Oxford than the Modern History School.

There is no doubt that study in an intensive specialised way has justified itself as a training not merely for professional historians or for teachers of history, but has proved itself an admirable preparation for life. Many men go to the English univer-

sities not with the intention of taking up the educational profession, but as a general training for the business world or the Bar, or other vocations. Large numbers of these men take up modern history both in their school and university course, so that in what I am describing to you this morning I am not speaking of something that is in the nature of an experiment which has still to justify itself, but of a course which has amply justified its usefulness both in the sphere of education and in practical life. It is this to which I would like to draw the attention of the teachers in the University of the Punjab. Your history school ought to afford a preparation and offer attraction not only to those who are intending to take up education as a profession, but also to those who intend to go into the business world or the sphere of affairs. Only when it attracts both types of students can it be said to be doing all the service to education of which it is capable.

Coming to closer grips with the subject, I will take up the curriculum of my own university, as it is naturally the course with which I am most familiar. But in describing it, I shall not be going very far away from the curricula of other universities. The History Curriculum in London is closely similar to that of Oxford, and it is not widely different from the curricula of Manchester or Cambridge. When the war came it produced a great intellectual upheaval as I remarked yesterday. Our old beliefs were shaken, and we began to examine our curricula to see what was the cause why many of those who had passed through our classes were comparatively ignorant of the course of events that had led up to the cataclysm. In London a curriculum committee was established for the examination of the curriculum and for reforming it wherever necessary. The whole thing was examined in the light of the experiences not only of our own people in the University of London, but of the experience of men like Sir Charles Harding Firth, Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, and so on. After the adoption of the reforms we recommended, I was selected as the Chairman of the Board of Studies in History and Chairman of the Board of Examiners, and I have been

working with this new curriculum for some 7 or 8 years so that I can speak with some familiarity of its suitability. I am more a believer in it than I was when I first began. I feel that the principles at the back of this curriculum may afford help to you in the problems of the University of the Punjab, and I will therefore attempt to outline them to you, though I cannot enter into details.

In the first place as to the method of training students, I may say that we desire to train different sides of student's intelligence. We wish to train his memory, to discipline him in accurate methods of reasoning and criticism and to encourage his initiative to investigate for himself. Each of these three desires is fulfilled in different parts of the curriculum. First of all we divide our history into four branches of which three branches are widely taken. First of all there is Ancient History which we regard not merely as the history of the classical period of Greece and Rome. We carry it down into the middle ages because we think that the contact of the modern world with the ancients should be traced through the mediæval period. So we call the first branch the Ancient and Mediæval Branch.

There are two Branches dealing with mediæval and modern history which go back through the middle ages to contact with the ancient world. Branch II deals with the history of the Western peoples ; Branch III with that of the East, with special reference to the history of India.

The most widely taken of these three branches is the second. The content of each of the branches is to some extent common. The work in mediæval history is common to both Branch I and II and the modern history of Europe is common to both Branch II (Occidental) and Branch III (Oriental). They all form part of one school.

In the examination of the candidates and in the courses that lead up to the examination we divide our subjects into three. We have first of all the obligatory subjects with which familiarity is absolutely necessary for everybody in any branch who pretends

to be a serious student of history. No man can take up any historical investigation, no man can properly apply the canons of historical criticism unless he has a back ground of sound reading upon which to base his conclusions. He must in fact have a considerable amount of historical knowledge in his head before he can venture to go any further. Therefore these obligatory subjects are insisted upon for everybody. To a large extent the training of a student must be directed to the cultivation of his historical memory and imagination, not merely a parrot memory but memory of a kind which will enable him to put his hand upon any piece of historical information with ease and without incessant recourse to a library for details. But, secondly, we include a kind of subjects in which we set the student free. We encourage him to pursue his methods of study and of reasoning in acquiring a background of knowledge in a field that is congenial to him. We call this part of the curriculum the Optional subject, and we prescribe several fields of study from which the candidate must select one.

Lastly, we have the special subjects where we offer a considerable number of alternatives from which the candidate must select one. The special subject that he chooses will be concerned with a highly intensive study in a narrow field of history. It will require comparatively little memory work, but will afford a means of cultivating the other powers of his mind. It will give him the power of historical criticism and teach him to construct from his material a clear and connected story of events. Thus we have in our courses obligatory, optional and special subjects, each planned to cultivate a different side of the student's capacity.

First of all as to the obligatory subjects. They must of necessity contain three elements. The student ought to know (1) something about the history and the growth of the community in which he lives and works, that is to say, every English student ought to know a good deal of English history and something of the contact of our people with other nations. (2) He ought to know something of the general progress of civilization in the proper group of nations to which he belongs. In the case of English

students, that is to say, they ought to know a fair amount of European history and they ought to know something of the ideas that have inspired the life of the European nations, some of those ideas which have furthered the growth of civilization. (3) The student ought to know something of the theories of political science or, as we prefer to call it, the History of Political Ideas.

In English history in Branch II, we do not separate political and constitutional history at all. The history of England, of Great Britain since the union with Scotland, and of the British Empire, is emphatically one of constitutional growth through political conflict—a process of gradual adaptation of the constitution to solve political problems. In our view you cannot dissociate constitutional history from political history. So our papers are devoted to English political and constitutional history jointly at different periods. The first period is the mediæval period going down to the middle of the 15th century ; the second period from the middle of the 15th century down to the beginning of the 18th century, with the opening of the Hanoverian period in 1714 ; the third period, we take down to the present day. By "present day" we mean roughly the reconstruction period immediately after the War, and I do not think any question is likely to be asked much after 1921. We can hardly see the most recent events in their true historical proportion, and they are too much involved in the atmosphere of controversy for a properly impartial treatment. Possibly our division is not entirely satisfactory, and it may be changed in the near future. Probably the second period will be extended to 1763 in order to throw greater weight upon the study of the modern period. The phrasing of the titles of the subjects is quite noticeable. The first one we call the "The Political and Constitutional History of England to the middle of the 15th century"; the second "The Political and Constitutional History of England and the *British Empire* to 1714"; and the third "The Political and Constitutional History of England and the *British Empire* to the present day." That is very indicative. It emphasises gradual growth. We say deliberately

England in the first period. The significant growth is not taking place in Ireland and Scotland, it is taking place in England. We do not pursue history with any patriotism. There is no aspersion upon Scotland by our omission of a detailed study of its history in the middle ages. We have to study the particular side of history in which there is a significant growth, and the significant mediæval growth was emphatically in England. Similarly in the second period. Again the significant growth is in England, but it begins to spread out with the extension of the English people overseas. We must devote attention to the growth of new American colonies in what is now the United States and to the early English activities in India and in the East. Lastly, in 1707 Great Britain was unified and we come to the central picture. Much of our constitutional machinery was developed and many important political struggles occurred outside Ireland and Great Britain, and they must be studied in the outer Empire.

Now let us come to our contact with the larger community in which the general course of civilization is proceeding. The essential centre of interest lies emphatically in Europe, and whether in Branch II for Occidentals or in Branch III for Orientals the study of the interaction of the European Nations is necessary, because it had vitally affected their position in the world of to-day. It is the growth of culture, the occurrence of historical happenings of every kind which have moulded the modern world. That moulding has gone on in Europe, and in saying this the historian is merely concerned with a statement of fact. He does not imply that Europe is essentially of more importance than the rest of the world. It has merely been the stage on which the significant movements have taken their rise.

For the practical purpose of our courses we divide European history into two periods, the first from the death of Theodosius down to the beginning of the 16th century, the second from 1500 to the present day. Both these sections are obligatory on all students taking Branch II, but those taking Oriental History in Branch III are only concerned with the second period when

the East was more intimately associated with Europe than ever before. So the student ought to become familiar with the general outline of the growth of the European nations from mediæval times onwards.

The last of the obligatory sections that our London students take up is the History of Political Ideas—a subject which covers the whole range of political ideas from the time of the Greek writers, Plato, Aristotle, and so on, down to the writers of today. This does not mean that the student has to study the subject intensively in all parts. Questions are set so that the student may satisfy his examiners if he has only an extensive knowledge of certain parts of the subject and a more intensive knowledge of other. The papers are divided into sections, each covering a different period. At least one question must be answered from each section, but greater care may be devoted to one section than to the other.

We come last to the optional and special subjects in which the student is allowed to specialise according to his own bent. He must choose the particular field in which he will do his more intensive work, and there he will work not merely on the writings of historians, but will try to make some history of his own, and with the aid of his own disciplined historical imagination construct from the materials something in the nature of finished history. The special subject is entirely a work on original materials. I do not mean to say original unpublished materials. That would of course, be impracticable, but documentary materials are selected and prescribed for study. Let us consider, for example, one special subject from one list "The Unification of South Africa, 1875—1909". Some 2,000 pages are prescribed and the documents are reprinted in the original language. If he takes up a mediæval subject the student will have to read his documents in the original Latin in which they were written. Another of our special subjects deals with the French Constitutions of the Revolutionary period, and there the documents must be studied in French. We are imitating as nearly as may be the work done by historical inves-

tigators. We are trying to train all sides of the student's faculties, his memory, his imagination and his powers of historical criticism. The optional subject chosen by the student bears a close relation to his special subject, and furnishes a background for it. If he takes up "The Unification of South Africa," he will select the colonial history of the British Empire, and he will study that intensively, not in the same detail as (he will take) his special subject, but in much more detail than (he would take) in his obligatory subjects.

To summarise I may say that the optional and special subjects together fill three-ninths of the curriculum, while the obligatory subjects take up six-ninths. Thus three-ninths are specially devoted to the training of the critical faculties, though I do not mean to say that critical faculties are not developed in the obligatory subjects.

If a student merely acquires historical information he can only pour it out in a thin stream in the examination paper, and he will have benefited only to a comparatively limited extent by his University work. Of course, he may get a degree, but he has never really gained the full benefit that distinguishes a University Course from that of a low-grade secondary school. But the real University student will do the most important part of his work neither in lectures nor in tutorial classes, but by himself in his library. I cannot insist too strongly that it is essential that a student must have constant access to a good library, just as a chemist must have a good laboratory. The library is the historian's laboratory, and it is there that his best work will be done.

I have taken more time than I intended to sum up the lessons that we have learned in constructing and working out our London curriculum. Branches of History are studied—ancient, occidental and oriental. Three kinds of subjects are included in each. The obligatory training of students with a view to give them the background of knowledge that all historians require. To train his critical faculty we use especially the History of

Political Ideas and the Special Subject. It is in this last part of his work that we set him free to follow out the subjects that specially attract him and allow him a free hand.

Mr. Gulshan Rai—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—History has not only to deal with the rise and fall of Ruling Dynasties in a country, but it is also its proper function to trace the social, religious and economic development of a nation. It was very rightly said by one of the speakers yesterday in this Conference that it is the task of the historian to set forth the history of the entire social organism of mankind. We see that in the physical world, the physical sciences such as chemistry, physics, astronomy, geology and meteorology are all interconnected. Again in the animal world we must study all such sciences as zoology, chemistry, medicine and veterinary science. In the vegetable world, botany, chemistry, and agriculture are all studied together. In the same manner when we come to deal with mankind, we cannot ignore literature, political history, constitutional history, religion, philosophy, politics, economics and sociology. While writing the story of a nation, a good historian will bring all these social sciences under contribution. In order to build up the story of man, we must include in our scheme not only the reigns of kings and queens, but also an account of religious movements of philosophic thoughts and scientific investigation of literary activities of the constitutional struggles of the people and of the economic condition of their country. Unless we deal with all these activities of the human mind, our story of mankind will be incomplete, and the histories we write will be defective.

Take, for example, the fact that the Indian people have been and are an intensely religious people. Within the four corners of our country we have today the representatives of all the great religions of the world. We have amongst us Hindus, Muslims, Budhists, Christians, Sikhs, Jains, Parsis and Jews. Have we ever stopped to think, how and under what circumstances these great religions have arisen? How they have moulded the life of the people? I will ask you to consider the extent to which this

aspect of the question finds a place in our present-day histories. In our Indian histories we no doubt deal with the rise of Budhism and Jainism, and we also therein find the circumstances under which these two religions arose. But the subsequent development of religious thought in India, e.g., the decay of Budhism, the rise of the new Hinduism, the Bhakti movement in Hinduism, the influence of Islam on Hinduism, the influence of Hinduism on Islam in India, the effect of Christian and European civilization on Hinduism and Islam, all these important points do not find a place in our present-day histories. Then again the development of our literature, prose, poetry and drama, the effect of Semitic and European culture on our literature and philosophy—all these things are also ignored. In Europe and America the Age of Discovery revolutionised the entire West. Have we stopped to think, how it affected India ? The effect of the arrival of Europeans in India, the way in which European contact has influenced our economic condition, our political view-point, our intellectual outlook and our social life—all these points have not been sufficiently emphasised in our history books. And yet the story of the Indian people will not be complete until it includes some account of all these various human activities. Our present-day histories of India are only chronicles of the ruling families. They cannot justly be called the histories of the Indian peoples. I am sure you will all agree with me, that what we want to teach our young men and young women, is not only the story of the kings and queens of India, or of the administrations of the Vice-roys and Governors in this country, but the life-history of the entire people. We want to trace in company with our young folk, the development of religious thought among our people, their social struggles during all these ages, the contributions our ancestors have made during all these so many thousands of years, to the thought and literature of the world. We must understand that our present customs, manners, institutions, arts and crafts, thought and tendencies are all an inheritance from the past. Shall we refuse to tell our students, who are to guide the future

destinies of the nation, how all this treasure that we have inherited from our ancestors was acquired ? If we understand the stages through which our people have passed, if we understand the national tendencies we have acquired, only then can we proceed on in the nation's march towards world's progress. We must therefore revise our present-day histories, and include in them (1) the development of religious and philosophic thought, (2) the varying economic condition of the people from time to time, (3) the development of literature and art and (4) the constitutional and political struggles of the people. But in order to write history in this revised form, we must realise that in the modern age no country lives or can live an isolated life. Man is a creature of his circumstances and surroundings. Exactly in the same way countries are what they have been made by their neighbours. Just think how the Græco-Bactrians, the Parthians, the Sakas, the Kushans, the Huns, the Persians, the Arabs, the Turks and the Mughals and the Europeans—all of them foreign peoples—have influenced the destinies of India. Do you think we can get a complete story of the life history of the Indian people without understanding the history of all those people who have invaded India and finally settled in this country ? Can we, for example, understand the Muhammadan period in our history, without understanding the Islamic movement that arose in Arabia in the 6th and 7th centuries A.D. ? Can we properly understand the modern European period in our history without understanding the causes that brought in Europe the Age of Discovery and in India the arrival of the Europeans ? Can we rightly understand the Græco-Bactrian periods in our history without understanding the movements which lead in that age to the migrations of the peoples in Central Asia and North-Western China ? What I am trying to drive at, is that in order properly to understand our Indian history we must have as our background the general history of the Oriental countries. We must know the history of Arabia, Persia and Central Asia in order to understand the history of the Muhammadan period. We must know the history of Western China, Central Asia, Afghanistan and

Khorasan to understand the history of the Kushan period. We must have a knowledge of European history to understand our modern history. In our present-day curriculum, we no doubt read European history, but we neglect entirely the history of Eastern Asiatic countries. The result is that we do not properly understand the history of our country in its pre-European periods. We must, therefore, include in our curriculum the history of Eastern countries.

Mr. Amolak Ram Khanna—Mr. President and gentlemen, it is with great diffidence that I venture to discuss the content of the historical curriculum. The question seems harder of solution in India. For with us there is a history of our own country to be dealt with. And that history is very complex—for it is a history of not one people but of many. Granted the complexity, I maintain—and here I am on sure ground—that our own history matters most to us. Now for the proper understanding of that history it seems to me that we cannot leave our neighbouring countries severely alone. No account of the history of the Mussalmans in India would be complete, if it did not include something of the history of the country of their origin. It has been a matter of great surprise to me that in India the two chief communities, although living so closely together for so many centuries, have yet been so utterly ignorant of each other. To bring about a better understanding I feel that a great deal could be done if greater emphasis were laid on the past history of the two peoples. So that the history of India will have to be supplemented by an account of the history of the Mussalmans before they arrived in India. This is one point.

To turn to the second I wish to draw your attention to some very valuable remarks made by Dr. Newton when he drew your attention yesterday to the misgivings caused to English Historians during the war. The insufficiency and the inadequacy of the history curriculum was brought home to them during the war by the general ignorance of the public of the causes that led to that catastrophe.

In India we, too, hear of many happenings, of ferment, of change in many Asiatic countries. The other day we heard of a revolution in China. Now China to most of us did not mean more than the name of a big country where people mostly went to sleep after consuming Indian opium. It is true that in the Government College we had Mr. Garrett who had spent some part of his youth there, and therefore came to our rescue to dispel part of our ignorance. But I put it to you, gentlemen, whether in India we need to know more about our neighbours or not. In my opinion it is desirable that our historical information regarding our neighbours should be increased.

The last point I will deal with briefly. Our relations with England and, apart from that relationship, the wonderful achievements of that little country, have made it very desirable that we would know something of its history. The University of the Punjab has not neglected this. But in this connection I wish to state that greater emphasis should be laid on the modern period than on the earlier periods. The same remarks apply to the constitutional history of England, the history of English Colonisation, and the history of the British Commonwealth.

Mr. Hervey—Speaking for myself, I am either for a highly intensive study of the original documents or for a broad sweep and not for something in between the two. We have had a tendency to boil down our study to something in between intensive study and a broad sweep which I deprecate. I have put down a few questions which every student ought to be able to know.

In what ways do you think the caste system has been a drawback to India?

Why has India so frequently been invaded? How far are western political institutions suitable to India. Is there such a thing as Indian national character? If so, outline the same?

I think a student of the Honours type ought to be able to answer questions of this sort. If he is able to do that, he will have an intellectual urge within him.

(The speaker then put certain questions to the Chairman which he answered ; he then proceeded) :

As far as Indian history is concerned, I do not know how it can be limited only to the modern period. There are special reasons why this cannot be done. India is made up of a number of civilisations and cultures which have all contributed their share, as, for instance, the Hindu, the Muhammadan, the Sikh and the British contributions. This is simplified by the fact that for early history there is not much historical record. It can, therefore, be done in a short time. Again as regards the history of the British Empire, you cannot have the whole sweep of it. India as it were is trying to make up for lost time and is still in the process of constitution forming. There are valuable lessons from other countries which India has to learn. If we study intensively the modern political developments, how can we leave out the mediæval contribution in England, the formation and growth of the parliamentary system ? English history up to 1400 has very specially valuable lessons for India. The students should have as part of their basic knowledge the main outlines of European history from the French Revolution to the present day. I also think they must have the main outlines of Islamic history and culture. If we say that all these are unnecessary, we might just as well say right away that we should insist upon the outlines of universal history as outlined by me yesterday.

Mr. Rajendra Singh—I feel that the history of Western Europe has been too much with us. We never study the history of Persia or Japan or China. I should suggest that a short course in the history of civilisation should find a place in our curriculum especially in that of our Intermediate Classes. There are broad fields in history which always remain unfamiliar to our students. If a student is given a broad view of Universal history, it will be very helpful to him. It will show him that mankind has a common heritage and common hopes and aspirations. His mind will be trained to move across centuries and continents, and he will begin to take a long and broad view of things. At present the student

is expected to think in national terms or to "think imperially." But he should be trained to think internationally so that the citizen of to-morrow may feel that he is a citizen of the world and not of this country or that country. Patriotism and imperialism are not enough. Our students should know the contribution each country and each age has made to the present.

(2) It is wrong to study other subjects under the name of history. I think the field of history is already wide enough and we have no need to trespass upon adjacent fields. Subjects on the borderland, however, can be studied with advantage—such as historical fiction and so on.

Mr. Ball—My chief complaint is against the Board of Studies. It must be thoroughly reorganised as it does not work efficiently.

So far as Indian history is concerned, we do it very scrappily. The present-day students are absolutely ignorant even of the proper spelling of the names of historical personages. I had recently to value certain answer papers in which the students have not spelt "Warren Hastings" correctly. When the students come to the college, they are absolutely in a mess. Having had no thorough grounding in the lower classes, they find it very difficult to grasp the subject.

Dr. A. P. Newton—I may say a word as to how the Board of Studies in History is constituted in the University of London. This constitution is regarded as one of the most valuable provisions of our Statutes, and it has been little altered in the various reforms of the University that have been made in the last quarter of a century. It is regarded as an essential part, an essential foundation of the University structure and so no alteration has been made in it. We may say in fact that it has proved itself over a long period as admirably adapted to serve its purpose to guard the interests of the subject, to ensure the maintenance of a high standard and to further the progress of knowledge.

The Board consists of the senior teachers of the subject, men who have devoted their lives to it, whose efforts are mainly

directed to extending the knowledge of history and who have had the greatest experience in connection with it. A lesser number of junior teachers is selected to represent that section of the staff of the University so that the views of the younger men may be fully represented, and that it may not be the case of conservatism of the old being unaffected by the liberalism and radicalism of the young. A third element of the Board is technically known as the category of "Other Persons," but their number does not exceed one-fourth of the whole Board. They are chosen by the Senate on the recommendation of the Board in order that they may represent the views of outside historians, and in order that they may keep the Board in contact with the views of the public at large. They are persons of eminence and great experience of the subjects dealt with by the Board. They are nominated to represent not the narrow or professional interests of the colleges, but as having an interest in the subject as a whole.

Such a Board made up of three elements—the senior teachers, the representatives of the junior teachers and the representatives of outside historians—forms an admirable forum in which all matters relating to history can be discussed ; and the recommendations of this Board are listened to with great interest and attention by the Senate. It is only very occasionally that the recommendations of the Board are overruled in the interests of the University as a whole, but it is only natural that this must sometimes occur. The interest of no one subject can be specially furthered. The Academic Council has to take an interest in the whole field of learning and see that the views of all the various Boards of Studies are taken into account before a movement is made. But in matters relating simply and solely to history the recommendations of the Board go through the Senate as a general rule with hardly any discussion. When an expert is speaking about his own subject and speaking about it at the request of the authorities, it is almost an insult to that expert to reject his views and to take the views of some other non-expert body. The Boards of Studies work efficiently well in their own fields, and it is upon their recommenda-

tions in regard to their own subjects that all the great British Universities work. But in order to make this possible and satisfactory it is essential that the composition of the Boards should be carefully guarded. If a Board were composed almost entirely of outsiders and the senior teachers of the University were mostly excluded from it, you could not expect satisfactory results. You cannot have a subject properly taught in the right university spirit unless you can trust its teachers. If a university professor cannot be trusted with regard to his own subject, then the whole thing is impossible. It is essential that the experts shall speak about the inside management of their subjects and shall deal with their subjects in a responsible fashion in such a way that their views are likely to be carried into effect.

That is a digression, but I am quite impenitent about having indulged in it because I am certain of the importance of this part of the organization of any university worthy of the name.

Now to sum up to-day's discussion. I sympathise with every word of what Mr. Gulshan Rai said. I think it is essential to sound historical study to deal generally with the social life of the people, and so forth. It is an ideal demand which we have satisfied as far as we can. The students for whom we have to teach have necessarily only a limited capacity to absorb knowledge, and it is essential that we should find some compromise between the different sides that are pulling against one another and clamouring for the inclusion of fresh things into the curriculum. You have to remember that some parts of your curriculum and your teaching must of necessity be extensive. You cannot expect people to have a detailed knowledge of every branch of historical study if you add too much to the requirements of the curriculum. You thereby impose an impossible burden upon the memory of students. Generalizations soundly based and intensive study in some one field will on the other hand provide him with a proper idea of the subject, will implant in his mind the historic sense and will make a seed-bed in which that sense can flourish. You cannot possibly expect your students to know detailed facts about too many things. Do not

particularise too much in the syllabus, by saying that this shall be done and that shall not be done, allow some freedom to your teachers. Some will study intensively in one part of the subject where it is particularly congenial to them and others in any other part. Provided it is done judiciously, I think it is much better for every teacher to do as he likes. I believe in freedom in learning. Every University Professor should be given free scope in some part of the curriculum and the things of which he has expert knowledge, and then the students will be able to derive far more inspiration than they would otherwise do.

The Conference then adjourned for ten minutes and reassembled at 11-40 A.M.

Dr. A. P. Newton.—Gentlemen, the second part of our proceedings this morning is to go into details over what we have done to a certain amount in general. Mr. Sita Ram Kohli will read his paper on the History Curriculum at Various Stages.

Mr. Sita Ram Kohli.—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,—We have had yesterday two very learned discourses on the importance of the study of history, its place in the scheme of university education and the relation of history to allied subjects. We have, again, this morning listened to a very lucid exposition of the general principles on which the history curriculum should be modelled for university students. I will not, therefore, roam over this field again. I propose to keep myself strictly within the limits of the subject of my paper, namely, the consideration of the history curriculum at its various stages in our own university. I need hardly tell you that our present scheme of studies in history was drawn up after a long and thorough deliberation on general principles in a meeting of the Conference of history teachers held under the presidency of Professor Ramsay Muir in 1913. Many members present here to-day took part in the proceedings of that conference. Being a student at the time, I had not the privilege of attending this Conference but, I retain some recollections of the meeting, as we were told of this fact by Professor Ramsay Muir in a casual conversation in our seminar class, and I have now refreshed my memory by looking up the printed

proceedings of the Conference. Professor Ramsay Muir in his opening address emphasized the two following points—firstly, that the object of historical study was to cultivate in a student what might be called the historical point of view; and, secondly, that a soundly designed scheme of historical training must include both broad surveys of past events and also an intimate study at first hand of some limited period. The professor further urged that no university was fulfilling its purpose unless its courses of study, in any subject, were so designed and conducted as to stimulate and provide training for those few and rare spirits who were capable of adding to human knowledge in its field.

It was in pursuance of these principles that our present history course was worked out. The course allows, in the first place, a reasonable latitude of choice so that the special interests of students and teachers should find some scope ; while, in the second place, there is a general progression in the course from a mere elementary and outline study at the Intermediate stage to more advanced and detailed work in the M.A. It also provides for broad surveys of past events and for a more intensive study, at first hand of some limited period of history. In the M.A. Thesis paper, provision is also made for some training in independent thinking and in criticising evidence for a student after six years' training in the historical course.

The present course has been in use since 1915 and to-day we have met again, after fifteen years, to consider whether any change in our history course is necessary or desirable, and I have been asked to initiate the discussion.

For my own part I might tell you, gentlemen, that in the maxim of change merely for the sake of change I do not believe. The more I have thought over our curriculum the more I have felt, that despite certain faults it is on the whole very sound and an admirable compromise between the practical and the ideal. To repeat the trite sayings, however : “ Nothing is perfect in this world,” and “ there is always room for improvement ” in

all schemes. Looking at it from that point of view I have a few suggestions to make, but I may repeat my conviction that I am not for any wholesale or radical changes or for too ambitious a programme.

One point on which great emphasis has been laid by previous speakers this morning, and on which I too have always strongly felt is that up to the B.A. stage, our present curriculum does not provide for an intimate knowledge of the whole range of Indian history. The student who takes up history in his Intermediate classes has to study only one of the two periods of Indian history, the Hindu or the Muhammadan period. Even this is not compulsory, for he is given the option of offering a period of European or Classical history. Again when he appears for his B.A. he has to study only the British period of Indian history. Thus during the four years of study of history for the B.A. degree, what the student, according to the present curriculum, has done is an outline of the history of England together with a little more detailed study of some limited period of English history, and two periods of Indian history. He had never had the chance of acquainting himself even with the outline of the whole history of India. The fact of almost total ignorance of the ancient and mediæval history of India by the average history graduate of the Punjab University has become the more emphasised since the abolition of history as a compulsory subject for the matriculation examination. Some sort of rearranging of the course to remedy this serious defect seems imperative.

It may be urged against this that history is only one of the two elected subjects and that a graduate is merely a "B.A. Pass" with no pretensions to having specialised in history. But if we examine the course for the B.A. Honours from this point of view we will see that even then the contention holds good. The Honours course also provides only for one additional paper on Indian history and that is always the Hindu period. So that a student who has passed the Intermediate with the Hindu period as his optional paper never gets a chance to do the mediæval or the Muhammadan period

even when he offers the additional papers for his Honours degree in history. More than this. The present regulations for admission to the B.A. classes place no restriction on a student in allowing him to offer history for the B.A. when he has done nothing in the subject at the Intermediate stage. Such a graduate even when he has earned the distinction of passing with Honours in history is hopelessly blank in the subject except perhaps for a period of a limited range in English, Indian or European history. I am not referring to any hypothetical case. Those of us who are engaged in college teaching come across such cases almost every day. And such cases, gentlemen, are by no means isolated cases ; by no means one or two, but a fairly appreciable number of students offer history in the B.A. even though they have had no training in that subject at the Intermediate stage. How is this defect to be remedied ? The defect, I submit, lies partly in our present scheme of studies in history and partly in the rules governing admission or promotion from one class to another in the college course. The two are correlated and every effort to remove the two together is bound to fail as it involves a long process of legislation through several governing bodies of the University. But is it not possible, I would ask, to enlarge the Intermediate course in Indian history so as to make it cover both the Hindu and the Muhammadan periods, say, roughly, to the death of Aurangzebe in 1707, or the beginning of the 18th century ? If we then shift back the starting-point in the British period of Indian history, *i.e.*, the paper that is prescribed as compulsory for the B.A., from 1757 to 1707, we will bring it into line with the Intermediate paper. It will mean a continuity in the papers on Indian history and I venture to suggest that this could be done without making the Intermediate course too heavy either for the students to prepare or for the teachers to cover by lectures during the long period of two years they have at their disposal. In fact, we have done it for several years at the Government College. Almost for the whole of the first academic year the history students in the Government College, both in the Intermediate and the B.A. classes, are put on

to work of a general nature which is preparatory to the University course and the University course they begin only at the end of the first and the third year as the case may be. And I assure you, gentlemen, that we have never experienced any difficulty in finishing, in one year in the place of two, the course prescribed by the University. Nor for that matter have the students ever felt that they are working under a strain.

As to the drawbacks in the regulations governing the admission, I believe that it is not, under the circumstances, possible to set them right. That involves, as I have said before, a bigger constitutional issue. Moreover, it does not affect history alone, but almost all subjects in the faculty of Arts are made to suffer by the existence of such an arrangement. What the conference, in my opinion, can do is to reiterate with greater emphasis what a similar conference urged fifteen years ago. That conference emphasised "the desirability of securing that students offering history in the B.A. examination should normally have taken the subject in the Intermediate." But we know that this recommendation was not accepted by the Senate, nor do I think that such a recommendation by the present conference is likely to meet with approval from the Senate. I have, therefore, another suggestion to make which might, though only partially, secure our object. Let this conference of history teachers make a strong recommendation to the authorities of the various colleges that, class time-tables permitting, the students of the B.A. class who had not studied history in the Intermediate be made to attend additional history lectures with the Intermediate classes. This too I may be excused for referring once again to the practice followed at the Government College—we have tried for several years and found it useful.

Another point where our history course falls short of our modern requirements is that it nowhere provides even for an elementary study in civics. The recent reforms in India have aroused, as we all know, a new interest in education in civic ideals and citizenship. Under the present conditions any one of us may

be called upon one day to assume the responsibilities of a politician. Even as intelligent citizens we cannot well do without having some theoretical knowledge of our social organism. Civics and history are perhaps more allied than history and any other subject. I need not dilate upon the relation of the two subjects, as the need of teaching civics was fully established in yesterday's sitting of the conference. But would the inclusion of civics make the course heavy at the Intermediate stage ? My own feeling is, and that feeling is of course based on experience, that it would not. I am afraid I will have again to refer to what we are doing at the Government College, but I cannot help it. We are giving a short course of lectures on civics ; and my friend and colleague Mr. A. R. Khana is doing that. I believe he devotes half of the cold weather term from October to December to giving a short course of lectures to the Intermediate classes in civics. I am told that a similar practice has been introduced at the Multan Intermediate College. On this point, however, my friend, Mr. Chaman Lal of that college, will be able to give you more information. So that from experience I can say that the inclusion of an elementary course in civics would not make the Intermediate course too heavy for the student. If, however, by a consensus of opinion it is felt that such additions as I have ventured to suggest would make the range of the Intermediate course much wider than a junior student can manage, I would suggest that we should economise in some other direction rather than leave out civics entirely. Except for these few changes, by way of addition, I would leave the existing Intermediate course as it is.

In considering the B.A. course I will repeat the warning which Professor Ramsay Muir gave to a similar audience at a similar gathering about fifteen years ago : the warning against the danger of giving way, in designing a course of study, to the natural temptation of including all the subjects which it was supposed to be able for an educated man to know : history, anthropology, sociology and what not. The field of history is, indeed, so vast and varied that it is impossible in any college course to treat all the

subjects that deserve to be taken up. All that we can do is to give a young graduate a sound working-knowledge of some of the more important branches of the subject and to train him in the methods of acquiring further knowledge. Of course, I will not be content with this principle in laying out a course for the M.A. degree as the student in that case is supposed to be specialising in history and, as such, certainly needs a much more elaborate course. But I would place the B.A. on a different footing. The B.A. is a distinct stage in the University career of a student and after this stage, as we all know, a large proportion of students drop the ordinary University course for professional studies and they take up service, business or other avocations in life. It is only a very small proportion that are destined in the end to take up the burden of original research. We have, therefore, to see whether the present history course or one which we might design for the B.A. suits the requirements of this large proportion of our University undergraduates. Another fact that we have to keep in view while designing this course is that most of the students who offer history offer it not because they have any special liking for this subject, but simply because the University regulations compel them to offer one of two elective subjects and that they find this one rather less difficult to manage than, say, mathematics, psychology or a classical language. Keeping these points in view let us examine, as I have said, whether our present B.A. curriculum is sound or whether it can be improved upon by changes or alterations or whether it affords room for enlargement in certain directions. Here again, I would repeat my conviction that the course is not so heavy or full that it cannot possibly receive a little more by way of addition. I take first the compulsory paper, that is, Part (i) of Paper I, the British Period of Indian History from 1757 to 1919. I have made already a suggestion in connection with the Intermediate course. To bring this into line with the Intermediate course I would widen the period so as to begin with the beginning of the 18th century, i.e., from 1707. In connection with this paper there is a note appended in the University syllabus that students should

pay special attention to the constitutional development of India. I would like to lay special emphasis on this point, and would go even to the extent of making a question on the administration of India obligatory in the examination paper. Part II of this paper provides for an intensive study of a limited special period of Indian history. The practice of the Board of Studies has been to prescribe different periods at different times, as for instance, the history of the Punjab during the Sikh rule, the reign of Akbar, the Reign of Aurangzebe and so on. Here I would suggest only a modification of this rule or the practice followed by the Board of Studies. Considering the importance of local history, and, in our own case, the history of the Punjab, I would venture to recommend that this limited special period must always be chosen from the modern period of the history of the Punjab. As you will have noticed, gentlemen, I have recommended no substantial addition to Paper I whether in Part (i) or (ii).

The group of optional papers offers a wide choice, a period of English history, a period of European history, a period of Classical history or the general outlines of Islamic history. I do not propose to enter into a detailed discussion of the relative importance for an Indian student of the three elements in this part of the course, European history, English history or Islamic history. A student will, no doubt, find some stimulating element for his training in each of these studies. I would not disturb this group of options although as an Indian if I were to make a choice I would do so in favour of English history. And this would be for two reasons: firstly, because of our political connection with that country; and, secondly, because of the immense influence which the English social and political institutions have exercised on the institutions of our own country during the last 150 years. For that very reason I would prefer to restrict the selection of the period of English history to a more modern period; instead of, say, the Tudor or the Stuart periods, I would select a period from 1815 onwards.

As regards the Honours course in History, I venture to say that, if the Honours degree is meant to be a genuine honours

degree the entire Honours course needs overhauling. This would also mean a change in regulations, inasmuch as a student preparing for the Honours degree in any subject will have to devote his whole time to the study of that subject alone and will have to be relieved of the other or cognate subjects. If that were not possible, I am perfectly satisfied with the present course. The M.A. course, I am not expected to discuss this morning as the whole of Wednesday morning's sitting of the conference will be devoted to a consideration of the post-graduate work.

One more suggestion and I have done. I feel strongly on the point that the University should altogether stop the practice of prescribing text-books in history. If this may not be found practicable at the Intermediate stage, I would certainly insist on it at the B.A. stage. We are all familiar with the psychology of the student mind ; how he looks upon the texts prescribed by the University, how he believes that those books alone contain the whole truth —this, in the words of a great historian—is the very idea which good teaching in history should aim at destroying. We can indicate the scope of the course or the scope of the paper by drawing up a list of topics bearing on the main features of a given period of history, and suggest a number of first-rate reference books. I need hardly tell you in this connection that a similar practice is followed in the Delhi University. For instance, the scope of the B.A. course in Indian history for 1929-30 is indicated by a list of topics detailed in the University Calendar. (*See Appendix*).

I have given you, gentlemen, my humble opinion, for what it is worth, on what I think our present curriculum in history is like and where it needs revision and how it can best be revised, keeping in view the possible application of the principles of an ideal curriculum to a practical one.

Mr. Abdul Qadir—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I feel very much handicapped because most of the points which I had to discuss before you have already been anticipated by the previous speaker. I shall, therefore, be very brief in my remarks

on the history curriculum. To begin with, I wish to point out that in our colleges history is not the only subject that we have to teach in the F.A. It is one of four subjects, and one of three in the B.A. We can, therefore, give only limited time and attention to it. Everything that we lay down here for the study of the subject must take into account this serious limitation. Secondly, I wish to point out that our syllabus should be so framed that it should be useful not only to those who wish to enter the educational line but also to those who wish to take part in the politics of the country. In India, we all know, a new consciousness is coming upon the people. We are developing new ideas of nationalism and patriotism ; and the students of to-day will have to fill positions of administrative responsibility ; and be the leaders of to-morrow—our Presidents and Ministers as we get self-government—and we have to bear this fact in mind. What sort of syllabus then should be prescribed ? My impression is that we in India at this stage need the study of two very important histories, that of our own country and that of England. We want that every Indian student whom we turn out from our colleges should know our past. There is a saying in the Bible that, if we gain the world but lose our soul, we have lost everything. In the same way, if we know the history of the whole world and do not know anything about the history of our own country, we know nothing. No Indian can be called a patriotic Indian or a good citizen if he does not know the history of his own country. We should, therefore, pay primary attention to the teaching of the history of our own country. Why then should we study the history of the British Empire in addition ? It is not only because it is the history of the country with which we are intimately connected, but also because it is the history of a very advanced country. It is the history of the rise of a people who have conquered practically the whole world, of the people who have established their dominion all over the globe. There is yet a third reason why there should be such a study ; for ultimately we are going to model our institutions on the basis of those that are in vogue in England. After we have thus studied the history of the

British Empire we should devote our attention to a study of the history of Europe, for European history can teach us many lessons. Western Europe at any rate is a living force ; it has formulated certain schemes ; established certain institutions which we might well emulate. So in our colleges, instead of frittering away our time on the study of the history of Central Asia, the history of Afghanistan or Persia, China or some other country like that, we must narrow our outlook, if you will pardon that expression, and study the history of these three countries—India, the British Empire and Western Europe as a whole.

Let us now pass from the abstract to the concrete, and see if the syllabus as prescribed in the University of the Punjab fulfils these conditions or not. I have come to the conclusion that the syllabus prescribed by the University at present does not fulfil these conditions. For instance, in the F.A. we find the history of England is made compulsory—it constitutes one paper. Then we have got three or four optional papers in the second part and among these you find the history of classical Greece. I know that Greece has done much for Europe. It has left a splendid legacy for the people of the western world, but I cannot conceive why it should be so important for the Indian student. I think we in India hardly need that study in the F.A. I find that the history of Europe has also been prescribed from 1453 onwards, and the third alternative is the history of India. The history of Europe, Greece and Rome and the history of India, all these are put on the same level. Can we recommend such a scheme of studies as will lower the history of our own country to the level of that of a foreign country, say, like Greece ? Greece for all practical purposes is dead ; and we do not need a study of Greece as much as we do a study of the history of our own country. It is, I should think, an insult to the history of India, to the people of this land, that their history should be reduced to the level of Greece. So I suggest that the history of Greece should be omitted altogether from the curriculum. I do not think the study is by any means popular ; very few take to it.

The history of India should be raised to a higher plane. It should be made compulsory instead of English history. The history of England important as it is, should take its place after that of India. According to my suggestion, therefore, the first paper should be on Indian history and the second on the history of England. Even there the history of England should not be taught as we do now. In the University examinations questions are often asked as to the events of the Wars of the Roses, the battles of the Hundred Years' War and so on. What earthly benefit is there to our students to learn these details ? We should teach the subject in its broad outlines. The movements of English history, the slow, gradual development of parliamentary institutions and such-like things should be taught. In other words, the history of England should be studied from the earliest times to this day, with particular emphasis on the constitutional development of the country. Side by side with this, I think we should study the history of the colonies to know how the English people have built up so vast an empire, how South Africa was conquered, how Canada was conquered, how Australia and New Zealand were colonised and federated, and so on. The history of the colonies should also be included in the history of England, and the whole thing should be studied in outline. This, I am sure, will not make the course bulky or burdensome. I agree very much with Mr. Sita Ram Kohli in what he said regarding text-books. I am strongly opposed to the prescribing of so many text-books for the F.A. students. I also agree with the previous speaker that a syllabus similar to the one he has read to us should be given. No books should be prescribed. Only the syllabus should be given to the students and the teachers. So much for the courses in the F.A. Now let me go on to the B.A. courses. No doubt Indian history forms a compulsory paper in the B.A., but then it begins with 1757. This means that a student who has not taken the subject in his Intermediate begins his study from that date. Even he who studies the subject in his F.A. begins at the wrong end, for, as was pointed out, only one out, of the three periods of Indian history

is prescribed as compulsory ; either the Hindu or the Muhammadan period is prescribed. This means that a graduate after four years of study knows only the Muhammadan period and the British period, or the Hindu period and the British, as the case may be. This state of things should be remedied and we should see that, in the four years' time that a student spends in the college, he is taught all the three periods of Indian history. To gain this end, I would suggest —again agreeing with Mr. Kohli—that both the Hindu and the Muhammadan periods should be prescribed for the F.A. Obscure questions should not be asked and questions should be related to the important points only and should be based upon a broad general treatment. Then the student having studied both the Hindu and the Muhammadan periods in the F.A., will complete his knowledge of Indian history by the study of the British period, which is prescribed for the B.A. In the B.A. besides British Indian history, we have another subsidiary period called the special period, forming part of Paper A. Sometimes it is the reign of Akbar, sometimes of Aurangzeb, Ranjit Singh, Shivaji, and so on. I find that very few of the professors in the colleges and even the students have the time to make an intensive study of the special period. Students are generally in the habit of reading 100 or 150 pages of some book on the special period. Thus the purpose of prescribing a special period is lost, and I would, therefore, omit it altogether.

I should then suggest that greater emphasis be laid on the constitutional development of India in modern times, rather than on the study of a special period. In place of the special period we should have a special study of the Indian constitution—an intensive study of the administrative machinery of the country. Taking the second paper, we find that there are four alternatives—this year we have the Tudor period of English history, the modern period of European History, the history of Rome and the general features of Islamic history. I suggest that Rome should be omitted altogether like Greece as being relatively unimportant for the Indian student. The modern period of English history, say from 1789 to 1919 or from 1815 to 1919, should be studied in place of the Tudor

period. The Tudors may have their importance for the English people, but they have none for us. The study of modern Europe should be retained as it is. I consider it very important for the student to know something about modern Europe. Even in the F.A. I should like students to be taught more about Europe than about England. In this way we would ensure that a pupil after four years of study has some real understanding of the history of his own country, and of that of England and Europe in broad outline. It is on these lines that I would like the present curriculum to be modified.

Dr. Newton—We have listened with much interest to the speeches just made which have been directed entirely to the practical needs of the situation and have suggested concrete changes. If Mr. Sita Ram Kohli, Mr. Abdul Qadir and other speakers who take part in the discussion would put their suggestions down in writing and pass them on to me at the end of the session, it would be of very great assistance to me in making my suggestions for reforming the curriculum in the course of the next week or so. The discussion is now open.

Mr. Sondhi—Sir, I wish to speak only as an examiner of the University in the subject of history, and, as such, I have a novel suggestion to make. Historians, being historians, cannot but advocate an extension of their subject ; but I am going to do the reverse. I suggest in all seriousness that English history be abolished in the Intermediate. I look upon civics combined with geography as much more important, and that has been, I am glad to say, already recognised. These two should take the place of English history. Judging as an examiner, I find that the students are incapable of understanding the broad sweeps of English history ; and the growth of parliamentary institutions, as suggested by Mr. Abdul Qadir, is so foreign to them that they cannot grapple with it at this stage. I may add that not only are the students incapable of understanding the subject, but the house must pardon me for saying it—the teachers themselves are incapable of teaching it properly. I have found in many cases such gross ignorance displayed

by the students that it cannot but reflect upon their teachers. I would, therefore, suggest the abolition of English history at this stage. If, however, this suggestion is not acceptable, there is no reason why the students should not answer the question paper in the vernacular. It does not stand to reason that a subject like Indian history should be taught in English and examined in English. The appalling handicap that the Indian student suffers in being compelled to answer in English is apparent to all those who have either to teach them or to examine them.

As regards the B.A. curriculum, I have no suggestions to offer in detail ; but I would like to say this : that the system which the University is now following of adding to the Pass course a few additional papers in order to constitute an Honours course is simply absurd. It is no use increasing the extent of knowledge. What is wanted is the better quality of knowledge to be expected of an Honours student ; and you cannot do it by simply asking him to offer three papers in addition to the Pass course. He must be taught separately, he must be taught on a different level from the Pass course pupil.

For the M.A. course, which I am told is to be deferred till to-morrow, I have only one suggestion to make, and that is with reference to the thesis. Emphasis is at present being laid on modern history. As the M.A. includes one compulsory paper and another alternative paper on Politics, it is desirable that certain subjects related to political science be also included in the subjects which are available for thesis work.

Dr. Newton—It is quite clear that we have got to the heart of our subject. I have here the names of several gentlemen desiring to speak and I, therefore, propose to modify our programme. To-morrow morning the first item put down is my address on the encouragement of historical investigation ; instead of that, I propose that we shall continue this discussion right on till 11-30 to-morrow. If that is the general view, I shall call upon the gentlemen whose names have been handed in to speak on the subject to-morrow morning, when we shall continue this discussion. Mr.

Hervey, and Mr. Gulshan Rai who will not be present here tomorrow will, however, speak now before we close for the day.

Mr. A. C. C. Hervey—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen I only desire to make a few remarks. In the first place we have to consider that the Matriculation and the Intermediate courses should be connected, as also the Intermediate and the B.A. I sympathise very much with what Mr. Abdul Qadir has said ; but I cannot help thinking that he spoke as if the Intermediate were an isolated course. If his principles were carried to their logical conclusion, we should not be teaching either in the Matriculation or the Intermediate or even in the B.A. the whole of any history in any one course. I would like to say, therefore, that it should be made compulsory to pass in history in the Matriculation. Then I would like to suggest the omission of economics from the Intermediate course. Economics is an advanced subject and I do not think that any European University includes it in the school subjects ; and in this country especially, when the students are not able to grapple with the intricacies of the foreign tongue in which the books are written, I think it can very well be postponed. If this separate subject of economics is taken out, we have much more scope to put in what we want in the history course. Considered by itself history is a small portion of the whole course. As was suggested yesterday, for instance, history is connected with classical languages, and we have got a great deal more. If we agree to postponing economics at the Intermediate stage, we will have room, as was suggested by Mr. Kohli, for, say, civics or some such other subject.

As regards the question of prescribing text-books, I think it was abolished once, twice, and even thrice. But always somehow or other it crops up. I would strongly advocate that there should be no text-books prescribed and no written syllabus even. I would just like to quote from our University Calendar in this connection. I may digress here a bit to state that in our M.A. in English we have not only books, but criticisms, and we find in the calendar : “ the following books suggest the line of criticism expected.”

We are thus not asked to criticise, but the type of criticism is prescribed beforehand. Turning to the history syllabus for the Matriculation, we find mention of big names, of the Civil War between Stephen and Matilda, the Wars of the Roses and the rivalry between the Houses of York and Lancaster, then Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck, the Yorkist pretenders. I do not think I have ever troubled about Perkin Warbeck since I came to India, in spite of the fact that I am instructed to do so by the syllabus. The surprising thing is that there is no reference made to the Renaissance, no reference to the invention of printing. I cannot continue it for want of time. I would strongly support the suggestion of Mr. Sondhi as regards the language of the examination, and the language of instruction also. I would recommend the vernacular as the medium in the teaching of such subjects as history, at least up to the intermediate course. I would also urge the separation of the Pass and the Honours school. As regards the teaching of English history in the Intermediate course, I think the establishment of separate schools in the sense I have pointed out will serve the purpose. Mr. Sondhi also recommended that we should not have English history in the matriculation. I have always insisted that English history should be taught in the Intermediate as Indian history is largely done in the Matriculation and again it will come up in the B.A. It is the correlation of these studies that is required and it should be seen that the course offered at one stage should not be done once again at a later stage.

Mr. Gulshan Rai—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I will not occupy much of your time, but shall only offer a few remarks. Mr. Sita Ram Kohli gave you an outline of what the curriculum should be at the different stages in our University course. I am happy now to know that history and geography have again appeared in the Matriculation course. In my time they were compulsory, but for some years afterwards they were made optional subjects. We have now in the first paper English and Indian history and in the second paper geography. That, I think, will be a suitable course.

When we come to the Intermediate, English history, comprising one paper, is compulsory. In the second paper a wide choice is offered between a period of Indian history, either the Hindu or the Muhammadan period, mediæval European history or Greek and Roman history. I quite agree with Syed Abdul Qadir that at that stage we need not have Greek or Roman history for it can serve no useful purpose for an Indian student. But, as regards Indian history, a limited period of it is not enough. What we need is the entire sweep of Indian history from the beginning to the end, somewhat more advanced than what we have at the Matriculation stage. One paper should be entirely devoted to the whole of Indian history ; while the second paper may be either confined to English history or to British colonial history. As we are connected with the British Empire, it is desirable that, in addition to Indian history, the Indian student should have some knowledge of English history or British colonial history.

Coming to the B.A. stage, I would ask the student to specialise to a greater extent. The present course, is in my opinion, very defective. For we have Indian History, from 1757 onwards, compulsory ; and then we allow several choices. Here again I quite agree with Syed Abdul Qadir that we do not want Greek and Roman history for Indian students. But we do want English history, we do want European history, as we want also the whole of Indian history, not merely a particular period thereof. I would, therefore, suggest alternative courses for the B.A. As the first alternative, I would propose that we should have Ancient India, and, as a background for such a study, the history of Ancient Greece, Ancient Persia and Central Asia. What I propose would be like this : that, if a student chooses this group, he would have in his first paper the history of Ancient India and in the second the history of Ancient Greece, Persia, Central Asia and other countries. If the student does not choose this alternative, I would provide for him a second choice consisting of Mediæval India, from 600 A.D. to 1719, and, as its background, the history of Islamic nations, of Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan and Central Asia. These respectively will form the

two papers. I have yet a third choice to propose, i.e., British Indian history from 1719 onwards, and, as a background thereof, the history of Europe and England. So far I have dwelt on the Pass course alone. In regard to the Honours course, I would propose that, since the man who takes the B.A. Pass course has to prepare in two other subjects, besides history, the Honours stage should be deferred to a period after the candidate takes his Pass degree. Let him spend a third year if he wishes to take Honours; and, when he has taken his Honours, I would allow him one more year for his M.A. That is what is done in the science courses of the University. If the candidate takes up Honours in the B.A., it would be after he has taken the Pass degree and then he should be given an intensive study of some particular subject and be expected to study the methods of historical investigation and the manner of conducting research work. Added to this, I would suggest that he be given lessons in the constitutional development of the different countries of the world. After qualifying for Honours, I should like him to take some special subject in which he is interested for his M.A. The University should offer him a choice of several alternatives. It is then that he should himself be able to carry on research work, deal with historical documents, as observed by Dr. Newton, and acquaint himself with the political theories not only of Ancient Greece and Rome, but also the theories which have prevailed in India from the days of Kautilya to the present day. Now he should be asked to prepare a thesis on the particular subject he has chosen. I agree, once again, with Syed Abdul Qadir that it is the practice of prescribing text-books that is responsible for the tendency to cramming. The students should have only the syllabus and be encouraged to read the best books on the topics prescribed.

Wednesday, the 16th January, 1929.

The conference reassembled at the Maynard Hall on Wednesday, the 16th, at 10 A.M., with Dr. A. P. Newton in the chair.

President—The conference will now resume the discussion on the Historical Curriculum at the Various Stages, where we left it yesterday.

Mr. Ponsonby.—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, In order to avoid repetition, I shall make only a few observations. In our college we read only up to the B.A., so that I can only speak about the Intermediate and the B.A. courses of history.

One thing I should like to emphasise at the outset, and that is the importance of Indian history. I should be sorry to see Indian History removed from the curriculum for the F.A. As was already stated, there is a gap between what a student studies in the F.A. and what he studies in the B.A. For the first two years he studies, say, the Hindu period ; in the B.A. he takes up the British period, and thus, there is a gap which he never bridges. Similarly, in the case where the Muhammadan period is chosen, the student loses touch altogether with the Hindu period. It is my personal feeling that something should be done at the F.A. stage to enable the student to know something of both the Hindu and the Muhammadan periods, so that, when he comes to the B.A., he may study the third period and round out his knowledge of Indian history as a whole. Of course, as you know, as he progresses from one stage to another, the instruction is more detailed and better than it had been in the earlier stages. Moreover, in the matter of Indian history, as you will see from the calendar, the number of books prescribed is very large, and I do not mean to say that the University expects the student to go through that mass of reading. Several books deal with parts which are common, and some with those which are not common. Now the student, and especially the mufassal student—I would crave the sympathy of the conference towards us who come from the mufassal, both students and professors, because we are far away from the main current of University education—believes he must read through all these books, and that means that he will have to spend a considerable sum of money on their purchase. And the mufassal student is not “ flush with cash ; ” and, therefore, he depends largely on the teacher, and the teacher, therefore, has to wade through all these books to choose those which will be of the greatest use to the students, and which, therefore, they should

purchase. A great deal of skill, patience and devotion on the part of the professor in a mufassal college is absolutely necessary.

Then, as regards the second paper, we have a series of options. Personally, I do not think that Greek or Roman history as an option is of any use to the Indian student. Again, let me give a personal instance. In my earlier years, I had the good fortune to know "a little Latin and less Greek;" and, during the ten years when I was a schoolmaster before I became a college professor, I had some experience of teaching Latin and Greek. This experience has been very useful for me. But it is not so for students who have no interest in Greek or Roman history. And you will sympathise with the case that I am putting before you. Not many weeks ago I saw an M.A. student floundering with a book that was prescribed, namely, Fowler's "Greek and Roman City States." For several weeks I noticed the young man struggling, not knowing what he was about. At first he declined the assistance which I offered; but, in the end, in sheer despair, he came to me for help. This I was able to give, for I knew from my own experience of teaching that that particular book was one containing a certain number of political theories based on Mr. Fowler's reading and interpretation of Greek and Roman history. This lad, though he had come up to the M.A., had known nothing of the elements of Greek and Roman history. I came to his rescue, and put into his hands two history primers, of Greece by Fyffe, and of Rome by Creighton. On reading through the first 49 and the first 62 pages of these books respectively, the student came to know what he was about. I give this instance just to show how it cuts a particular student both ways. To the average Indian student, that option of Greek and Roman history is of no use; and yet there does come a time when, if he goes higher up, he finds among the books which he has to study for the M.A. one dealing with Greek and Roman history, of the elements of which he is ignorant.

I next wish to draw your attention to the stuff that we are dealing with. I have talked to you about the multiplicity of

books, and now I want to enlist your sympathy for the students of mufassal institutions. They are not so intellectual as students of the larger towns, and they come with very little in them, and it is for us, therefore, as their teachers to see that the books that are put in for their examination do not increase in number.

Just to repeat : (1) I believe that it is good for the student to know all Indian history ; (2) that we should not get rid of English history ; and (3) that the option of Greek and Roman history is of very little use to the average Indian student.

Mr. Chaman Lal Kapur—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have come fairly well fortified in my mind against any temptation to criticise our present curriculum or to repeat the oft-repeated historical platitudes. Criticising the curriculum at this stage would be like beating a dead horse—it would serve no useful purpose ; and mere platitudes will not help us in arriving at any definite decisions. But I wish to draw your attention to one or two things, which have been, more or less, passed over by others.

All of us are agreed about one thing : that our present syllabuses stand in some, if not in sore, need of improvement. But, when, we come to consider constructive programmes, our agreement ends, and we differ widely, making confusion worse confounded. As I said before, I will not yield to any temptation to indulge in criticism of a vague and general nature. I will take up things as they are and suggest improvements in the concrete. Let me take up first the Intermediate syllabus. There are two papers—the compulsory and the optional. In the first place, I object to the introduction of "options" at the Intermediate stage. The age of the student ranges between fifteen and eighteen, and he has during his school career made no approach to history, especially none to English history, through story and literature, as students do in England ; and he cannot be expected to make a choice for himself when called upon to do so. Besides, in actual practice, the choice rests not with the student, but with the college, and the college may not, in fact cannot, make the best choice for all. Again, if

we scrutinise the options provided, we find that a student may, if he likes, leave out Indian history altogether by taking up option 2 or 3. This is certainly not desirable. But perhaps there is another motive behind it. There is an anxiety to provide for the European candidates. This zeal to provide facilities for the European candidates is not well placed. If even those of European extraction, who are born and bred and educated in our land, are allowed to remain completely ignorant of the history of our country, we have surely to thank ourselves if they do not understand us, or if they fail to appreciate and sympathise with our national aspirations. It will thus be both reasonable and useful to cut options altogether. We should determine definitely what we want to give our students and give it.

The other thing to which I desire to draw your attention is that we make no systematic or scientific approach to the study of history. We begin the history of our own country or of England without caring to know or tell what history is. I remember, in Economics, the first topic in the syllabus used to be 'What is "Economics" ?' We never have such things as "What is history ?" "What is its scope and method ?" If considerations like these were introduced, it would make the study of history more intelligent, more methodical, more systematic and above all more fruitful.

Another difficulty which teachers in my position must be quite familiar with is that the Intermediate student at least can, with great difficulty, be made to understand the real significance of Western institutions—they are so foreign to him. A good plan would be to take the student away from the dry bones of history and to put him, for some time at any rate, on to such questions as "How has society evolved from its rude beginnings"? "What are the bonds of society?" "How does law cement society and promote security?" "What part does custom play in the affairs of man?" and questions of a like nature. These are questions of deep human interest and will certainly interest the student more than the Arab invasion of India or the Norman conquest of England. I was discussing this same point with Professor

Sondhi yesterday, and he expressed the whole thing very aptly when he said that we should give the students at the Intermediate stage just a foretaste, or better a very small and dilute dose, of political science, that much-dreaded and much-misunderstood subject. I have some personal experience in this matter of over five years now. I have always started my students on considerations like the utility of marriage or the importance of the family or how some sort of government is necessary even within the family for the comfort and happiness of its members, and I have found that this gives my students a better insight into history.

Another thing which I want to point out to this conference is in regard to the M.A. syllabus, though really it falls outside my scope as I am teaching the Intermediate classes only. The M.A. syllabus shows some obvious and unmistakable gaps which may well be filled up. To give a personal instance, I scored easily the first position in the History M.A. without knowing anything about Sociology. To be sure, I learnt that history had an intimate connection with it, that history is a social science, but I had no chance to know all or even enough about social science. My notions of some essential considerations ever before a thoughtful student of history were given no chance to become clarified and crystallised. Again I had no chance to make even a distant acquaintance with anthropology. If subjects like these could be introduced in the M.A. syllabus, it would certainly make the education of one who takes his M.A. in history complete and broader and more liberal, it would make for a better understanding of the acts of history and a better interpretation of them.

Lastly, I wish to say a word about the absence of any connection of the teaching of history with modern advances in historical knowledge and research. May I ask how many of our M. A. students know even the names of celebrities like Carter, Woolley, Layard and Rawlinson, Holdeway, Budge, Rassam, King or Thompson—men who have really revolutionised our knowledge of the past.

Mr. Jag Mohan Lal—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall not take up much of your time. My object in coming here today is to plead particularly for a special insistence on the teaching of Indian history. But I approach the subject from an entirely different point of view. What we have been teaching to our students so far is Indian history, not Indian culture. It is impossible to understand Indian history aright without understanding Indian culture. Few people, I believe, will challenge, my statement that even Indian history as it is known to-day is very often the history of Indian kings and Indian dynasties rather than of the Indian people. My suggestion may seem ambitious : it is that, in order to remedy this state of affairs, the history syllabus in the M.A. be so modified as to include special degrees similar to the Calcutta University degrees, in Ancient and Mediæval Indian history and culture. A lot of good work has been done in the Hindu period, and almost every day thesis and memoirs are being published. The period is nevertheless so vast and the problems so many that it will continue to be a source of fruitful investigation for many years to come. Much good work has been done in the Muhammadan period too, especially on the political and the economic side, but the social side has been almost entirely neglected. Certain important movements have, no doubt, been taken up, as, for instance, the Bhakti movement in southern and northern India ; but as yet very little work has been done in this respect. Coming to the Sikh period, there is a valuable mine of historical information and ample material to work upon. Next, as an encouragement to historical investigation, we should take particular periods as the background for historical study and prescribe them for the Honours course. For example, in the case of Sikh history, a study of the social and political tendencies of the Sikhs and a discussion of such religious principles as have reacted upon their political evolution and development would furnish an admirable background. Likewise, in the Muhammadan period, we should study the action and reaction of Muhammadan culture on Hindu culture, and so on. Besides, the only proper way of understanding

the various cultures is to try to understand the aims and objects of the pioneers who came here. In regard to Islam, it is the pioneers, rather than the sword of the conqueror, that spread that religion here, saints and Sufis, who came and settled here, leading the life of missionaries. Likewise, there are many important tendencies and movements in every branch of the study. We of the University of the Punjab must in a similar way lay more emphasis on the history of the Punjab in the B.A. Honours courses as a period of special study.

I shall briefly refer to the Intermediate and the Matriculation stages. The revolutionary suggestion was made yesterday to remove English history altogether from the curriculum. I venture to suggest that, instead of dropping it, we ought to have a very brief outline of the history of parliamentary institutions taught to the Matriculation students and those in the Intermediate classes so that they may understand the soul of English history, and, instead of insisting upon a knowledge of dry facts, we should pay attention to leading tendencies and movements in English history.

As a further incentive to sound, historical study excursions to places of historical interest should be made, a more regular and constant feature of the work of the history professor. In the case of senior students at least, there should be a definite programme planned beforehand so that the students may know what particular features they are going to study there.

Last, but not least, wherever possible, there should be separate rooms meant exclusively for history teaching, where maps, charts, historical pictures, etc., might be hung. In the case of senior students, there might be a small museum where coins, manuscripts or other antiquities likely to create interest in historical studies might be suitably displayed in glass show-cases.

Mr. Muhammad Shafi—For the last two days the teachers of history have been engaged in building up a superstructure of reinforced concrete without examining the materials used in the foundation. This year the Punjab University have prescribed Indian as

well as English history in the Matriculation, utterly indifferent to the hardships imposed upon the already overworked youths and unmindful of the fact that these students have to appear in six different subjects and have not got unlimited time at their disposal.

I, therefore, recommend that English history should be abolished altogether and that a Matriculate be expected only to have a broad sweep of all the three periods of Indian history. If it is considered absolutely essential to prescribe English history, it must be in place of geography. But my candid opinion is that we must not dispense with Geography, for an elementary knowledge of Indian geography at least is absolutely essential for Matriculation pupils. Our young Matriculates often display a woeful ignorance about the Geography of their own country. Professor Gulshan Rai yesterday proposed that our students must study the history of Asiatic countries, of China because it has awokened from a sleep of centuries, of Persia for it has freed itself from superannuated prejudices, of Afghanistan where the genius of King Amanullah Khan has raised a third class state to the Olympian heights of international importance, of Turkey which has been completely transformed by Ghazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha. I do not want that the mental equilibrium of our young men should be disturbed by extra-territorial sympathies. But I think that English history must be compulsory in the Intermediate so that the students may recognise that they are the citizens of the mighty British Empire, and they must know the gradual development of this tiny island into the greatest power of the world, which even that transcendent military genius, Napoleon, could not shake. They must study the gradual development of that wonderful institution, the Parliament, which is the mother of all the democratic institutions of the world. In the second paper we must have three options : (1) Hindu period, (2) Muslim period, (3) Civics ; to keep the students in touch with the history of their own country and their own civilisation ; and to awaken in them a keen interest for the service of their fellow-beings. In the B.A. we must have the British period as a compulsory paper ; but particular attention must be paid to the con-

stitutional development of India. In the second paper we must have four options : (1) Political Science, (2) European history, from 1789, (3) England since Waterloo, (4) Islamic history, from the birth of the Holy Prophet to the end of the Abbaside period.

Lastly, some of my friends have advocated the abolition of text-books. But I submit that, if you prescribe no books, you will drive young and enthusiastic students to feed themselves on the trash put into the market by note-writers, or they will be groping in darkness and there will be a justifiable spirit of discontent and unrest in the student community because of this extraordinary treatment.

One of three options.

The following is a tabular statement of my proposals :—

1. *Matriculation*—

(Paper A) Indian History.
(Paper B) Geography.

2. *Intermediate*—

(Paper A) English History (Compulsory).
(Paper B) { 1. Hindu Period. 2. M u h a m m a d a n Period. 3. Civics.

3. *B.A.*—

(Paper A) British India (Compulsory).
-----------	----	-----------------------------------

One of four options.

(Paper B) { 1. Political Sceince. 2. European History, from 1789. 3. England since Waterloo. 4. Islamic History.
-----------	----	--

Mr. N. C. Daruwala—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have at the outset a few suggestions to make regarding the courses to be prescribed.

I would propose that a sub-committee of this conference should be appointed, including you, Sir, at least one Professor of Economics, a Professor of Political Science, several Professors of History, at least one Professor of English and yet another for Geography, and that the sub-committee be instructed to draw up the courses and the curricula.

Next, I wish that this historical conference, when it takes place next time, should be a part—and an important part—of a larger whole, an educational conference like the Conference on New Ideals in Education and other Annual Educational Conferences in England. There, if we can influence the teachers and heads of schools and colleges, an important part of our work is done, and there will be less chance of our resolutions being merely on paper.

I should next suggest that we go back to what we said the first day about the close connection that exists between English, economics, geography and history. I really think that geography, the princess among the sciences, should take its rightful place, and that it should be taught on modern lines. Even such a conservative University as Oxford has been giving a diploma in geography for many years past. I believe that our Central Training College is doing extremely good work in this subject under the guidance of Mr. Sohan Lal. If you will excuse me for the reference, I may say that in Bombay, history and geography are compulsory at the Matriculation stage. Someone was complaining that the poor Punjabi boys could not understand history and geography. For Matriculation in the Bombay University, the history of England, the history of India and the elements of Indian administration are compulsory. The remarks of Professor Sondhi and Professor Sita Ram Kohli and others lead me to think, that in the Matriculation, history and geography or civics should be made compulsory; while in the Intermediate, English history should be abolished

and so should economics, and in their place civics should be made compulsory. I not only agree with the suggestion that some subjects should be compulsory for all history students, but for all students before they take their Arts degree. In Bombay, according to the old course, we had to take English history since the Restoration, Indian history from Babar and political economy as a part of liberal education. I should say that the History of India should come first ; then the history of England ; then European, and, lastly, world history.

Next I would suggest two years for the Pass course as at present, an additional year for Honours and another for the M.A. For the M.A. I would abolish the thesis, which at present is a sort of glorified essay, and leave the "research thesis" for a research degree—say, the Ph. D.

For the Matriculation.—Coming to the actual courses I would suggest that History and Geography be made compulsory. You might then have Indian History, Geography and Elementary Civics, or Indian and English History and Geography, or Civics and Hygiene.

For the F.A.—Civics should form one paper. The second paper should be on the main currents of Indian history (the whole sweep), and I would add another paper on any one period of Indian history, Ancient India, or from Mahmud of Ghazni to Babar or from Babar to the present day.

For the B.A. Course.—The history of India in outline, and a special period, with special emphasis upon geography, should form one paper. The second paper should be on elementary economics and Indian economics. The third paper would be on the history of England, political and constitutional, especially from 1688 to 1911, if you stop with the Parliament Act ; or 1914, if you wish to bring it up to the Great War. I would further provide for a choice of any two out of (a) a short period of Indian history different from the period chosen for the first paper ; (b) European History from 1815 to 1914 or some other period, with special emphasis on

standing up : The first is that the historical curriculum of the Delhi University has been brought up in the discussion ; and the second is that the history curriculum of the Punjab University, even like Tennyson's brook, goes on for ever in the same old way, though men may come and men may go. As a product of the Punjab University and being next door in Delhi, I thought I would venture to make some suggestions to-day. First of all, the syllabus of the Delhi University has been read and explained to you by Mr. Spear ; secondly, the gentleman from Kapurthala has anticipated me in regard to another suggestion. I would, therefore, mention only a few points that I wish to bring before the conference.

One is the study of Indian history here. I think Indian history has been made a compulsory subject in the Matriculation, in the Intermediate and in the B.A. It could be conveniently divided into two periods, ancient India *plus* the mediæval period forming one, together with (as we have in Delhi) if possible, an elementary course in the history of civilisation. That would be a suitable background for the study of ancient India because, with the new discoveries linking up the Indian with the Sumerian civilisation, India's contact with the outside world from ancient times has been established ; so that you cannot neglect other civilisations of the ancient world and understand that of ancient India. In the second paper I would like to have English History, again as we have in Delhi, in broad outline, sketching the growth and development of institutions. Such a study is quite important, especially in this period of transition, when we ourselves are trying to adopt those very institutions here. Again, the growth of Commerce and Industry in England should be studied, as we are in a period of transition even in the commercial sphere, and should stand to gain and benefit by the success and the mistakes of the Western world in this field.

In the B.A. the modern period of Indian history, beginning with 1500 A.D., should form the first paper. It will be very convenient to study the whole period at a stretch as it is really remark-

able how institutions persist as, for example, the reforms of Sher Shah being carried on by Akbar and continuing to persist even down to British times. This period of history should go as a whole for another reason too ; namely, that the history of European travellers and their early settlements, their gradual development and natural culmination in the foundation of the British Empire in India extends over this period. In the second paper, since we have done English history in the Intermediate, we should have the history of modern Europe, the development of world policies, with a study of some important constitutions of the world. That paper should be divided into two parts, modern European history and modern constitutions.

There is one more point. That is with regard to the thesis. We have got innumerable records in the Punjab Record Office which offer a fruitful field for investigation, but I think that there should be some correlation with the Archaeological Department as their discoveries at Taxila and other places would help those who would like to work on the inscriptions and records. With a knowledge of Pali, which it is easy to learn for a student of Sanskrit, the investigation is bound to be more interesting and fruitful. The pen of the historian can well help the spade of the archaeologist.

Mr. Teja Singh—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall confine myself to one or two points.

The first thing concerns the discussion itself. I do not think this desultory discussion spread over two days and not directed to passing any resolution will lead to any tangible result except that you will have a report to be enjoyed and consumed ; and, probably in the course of a year or two, it may help in the framing of a revised syllabus. I, therefore, propose that we should express our co-joint opinion in the form of definite resolutions.

The suggestion was made yesterday that there should be no text-books. Yes, that will be a very good thing in places where you have efficient teachers, when the students will not go so much to text-books on the subject. But, if there are no text-books,

there is a danger that they will run off the track, as has so often been suggested, into "the broad sweeps" of history. Talking of the broad sweeps of history at the Matriculation or the F.A. stage is, I think, dangerous. You cannot talk at that stage of culture, of parliamentary institutions and similar things. It is good that such things are deferred to the B.A. and the M.A. But, if there are to be no text-books, I would suggest that we resolve upon a creed in the teaching of the subject. For example, in teaching Indian history, it should be resolved that we should present it as a continuity and unify the history of the south and the north of India. At present, it is the history of the north only, though slight references here and there are made of the history of the Deccan, as, for instance, in so far as the reformers Ramanand and others came from the south to the north and spread their religious movements. The history of India, as written and as prescribed here, is the history of the northern half only. The syllabus should provide for a study of the whole history of India. The history of India should be united in the sense that it is culturally united. Also the history of the country should not be divided into Hindu, Muhammadan and British periods. It should be the history of the Indian people as a whole. The time has come when we should think of the Indian people. That can be done only if we adopt a creed whereby we should treat all past figures of our history as our ancestors. It would be just as Sir Walter Scott described the defeats of the Scots and the successes of England as if they belonged to one whole. We should think that Aurangzeb was as much ours as Shivaji, and it is this attitude that will hold up before the students' mind the idea of a United India. There is another thing which I wish to be brought into our study of Indian history. At present, when a Hindu writes the history of India, he emphasises the Hindu rule, while the Muhammadan writers do the same in regard to the Muhammadan rulers, and yet a third man like Vincent Smith shows that all our ancestors were fools and rogues. We should be taught to have pride in our history.

I agree with the suggestion that we should have the history of the Punjab for the B.A. course. The suggestion that English history should be abolished for the Matriculation and the F.A. meets with my approval. In regard to the M.A., the study of constitutional history should include a study of the Indian constitution in the past as well.

Dr. Newton—One point about Mr. Teja Singh's speech, before we carry the discussion further. I should like to make it clear to the conference that for my part I do not at all think that all this discussion is a waste of time. After all, remember that the essential part of this conference is myself. I am very sorry indeed that it is so, but I have been asked to come here and give some advice to the authorities of the University of the Punjab on the general study of history and its teaching. I can assure you, gentlemen, that I am learning at every moment of this discussion. I can also assure you that I am not going to leave this province without laying some very definite suggestions before the authorities. I may tell you what is happening in this way. Constitutionally I do not think that conferences like this can pass resolutions, and I do not think it really very much matters whether they do or do not. It is because you have no constitutional means of approach to the authorities of the University. But in Lahore a group of senior teachers in whom considerable confidence can be placed are meeting me in private consultation to discuss the means for practically carrying out the generally expressed views of this conference. Then at a particular moment, which will not be very long delayed, I propose, as a co-opted member of the Board of Studies in History to put some definite, cut-and-dried suggestions before the board in the light of the discussions here. I expect that the board will discuss my recommendations, and then, constitutionally and quite properly, make recommendations to the Syndicate or the Academic Council of the Senate, whichever is the body that is to act upon them. That is how I hope that in a very short time you will find some definite results appearing from our discussions here. That, I think, is a much safer and surer

method of approach than merely passing resolutions which shall be put down on paper, or attempting in such a large body as this to debate practical details concerning the curricula which from my long experience must necessarily be drawn up by very small bodies. I shall have something to say after the discussion is over, but I only wished to impress on you at this stage that we are by no means beating the air, but we are doing actual, practical, definite work.

Mr. Sohan Lal—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have come before you to offer a few suggestions which, if the conference approves, may be passed in the form of resolutions and sent to the proper authorities for necessary action. I have every hope that the considered opinion of this conference will have great weight with the authorities.

At the Central Training College every student has to take one of these three subjects—Mathematics, Science, History and Geography—as his special subject. All the students who cannot take up mathematics or science as their special subjects are allowed to take up history and geography. The result is that in the history class there are some students who have never studied either history or geography in college. There might even be some students who have not offered history and geography even for their Matriculation examination. Such men cannot be expected to be fit teachers of history and geography after a year's training at the Central Training College. I, therefore, suggest that this conference should recommend that no student should be allowed to offer history and geography as his special subject at the Training College unless he has studied either history or geography in his Intermediate classes.

The second suggestion which I wish to make is that in all Government High Schools there should be at least one trained graduate, who has studied history in his B.A. classes. At present, generally history and geography are taught by men who have never studied either of these subjects in the college classes. When a science teacher is to be appointed in a High School, the

Inspector of Schools insists that he should be a B.Sc. At the appointment of a history or a geography teacher in a High School why should not a trained graduate in history be demanded ? Such a man will not only improve the history or geography teaching in the higher classes, but will have his influence in improving the teaching of the junior teachers in the middle classes. When Mr. Sanderson was the Inspector of Schools in the Lahore Division, he introduced a very good system of subject faculty meetings. According to this system, all the teachers of history in a school met under the presidentship of the senior teacher and discussed the syllabuses, practical work to be done, excursions to be taken by each class. In fact, the senior history teacher, if he is an enthusiast, has a very healthy influence on the whole school. All the Inspectors of Schools demand that for science teaching there should be a minimum of apparatus in the school. In the same way, they should demand that for history teaching in all schools there should be in the library a minimum number of books, maps, charts and pictures.

The third suggestion which I wish to make is that the history of England should be abolished from the history course of the Matriculation and S.L.C. examinations. This is too great a burden on the memory of the students, and they never understand it properly.

My fourth suggestion is that passing in history and geography in the Matriculation examination should be made compulsory.

All teachers and examiners in history agree that students show in their history answer-papers an appalling ignorance of geography, and that a knowledge of geography is extremely necessary for the proper understanding of history. Hence I propose that geography should be introduced in the Intermediate classes as a part of the history work, as was suggested by Mr. Sondhi yesterday. If the conference does not agree to the teaching of geography in the Intermediate classes as a part of the history syllabus, I would strongly advocate that the history students in

the Intermediate classes should be encouraged to take up geography as a separate subject, as is now allowed by the University regulations. At present there is no provision for the teaching of geography in any of the Government colleges, except the Lawrence College at Ghora Gali, where very good work is being done. Among the private colleges of the province there is provision for teaching this subject only at one college, i.e., the Forman Christian College. I, therefore, suggest that this conference should make a strong recommendation to the Director of Public Instruction that provision should be made for the teaching of geography in all Government Intermediate colleges. I need hardly dilate upon the importance and great value of geography as a subject. If you allow me, I have to make just one more suggestion, that is, that civics should be introduced in the Intermediate classes as a part of the history course.

To summarise, my suggestions are—

- (1) That at the Central Training College any student who has not taken history or geography in his Intermediate or B.A. classes should not be allowed to offer history and geography as his special subjects for his final examination.
- (2) That in all Government High Schools of the province there should be at least one trained graduate who has studied history in the B.A. classes.
- (3) That the history of England should be omitted from the M.S.L.C. examination, and that passing in history and geography in this examination should be made compulsory.
- (4) That provision should be made for the teaching of geography in the Government Intermediate colleges of the province.
- (5) That civics should be introduced as a part of the history syllabus in the Intermediate classes.

Dr. Newton—Mr. Sohan Lal's speech has been an exceedingly practical one, but the unfortunate part of it is that it is not

within our province to say what he has been saying. The whole of it is not a matter for the historical conference dealing with the curriculum of the University. It is for some educational conference with a less specialised membership to take up the suggestions. Nevertheless we should be acting quite properly in putting them down on paper so that they may be discussed in the right quarter when the time comes.

Mr. Kahan Chand Khanna—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, At the opening day of the conference I asked a question regarding the proportion of internal and external history that ought to be taught at the various stages of our curriculum. The President told us yesterday what particular proportions are being followed at the London University. He has just now told us that he will make some very definite suggestions regarding this matter before he leaves. I hope that the suggestions that he makes will be very helpful and will act as a sure guide to us in determining how much emphasis should be laid on one or other aspect of history. In my own opinion, our curriculum is all right in the main, but it is not systematically well linked-up. I think personally that we cannot ignore Indian or English history at any stage. We have to read them right up from the Matriculation to the M.A. The question is how much of European or Asiatic history can be taught on the basis of these two. The ties of this country with England are indissoluble so we shall not do well to ignore English history ; and in doing English history we can naturally stress the history of the British Empire.

There has been a good deal of talk about what the curriculum should be, but until this morning little was said as to how the curriculum should be worked. I have to offer a few practical suggestions on this, which are based on my own experience as a teacher. To my mind, the question of how the various classes should be taught at the various stages is a very important one. My idea is that we give the students far too much at the Matriculation stage in particular. We tell our boys at the Middle stage nearly as much as we tell them at the High or even at the

Intermediate stages, with the result that they know as much or as little as they did before. We should weed out all unnecessary details. A clever teacher should always set limits for himself while teaching history and should stress only the facts he has chosen, and leave out other details. Then we can be sure that our boys do know some facts for certain. As we advance in their study through the successive stages of the Intermediate, the B.A. and the M.A. we can go on completing the picture by filling in more and more details.

There is another point. We miss historical geography very much in the present curriculum. I am not sure whether we ought to teach history and geography compulsorily as separate subjects. It may be found difficult to fit both of these into a general scheme of education. But I am sure that every teacher of history, if he is keen about it, can always stress historical geography in his lectures. There is no doubt that this ought to be done. Without this it is impossible to do any teaching of any value. Letting alone the student, the teacher of history himself cannot visualise the facts of history and give them a setting in the mind which is essential for all proper teaching.

In this connection I want to suggest that it should be made compulsory for students to bring into the class outline maps of the epochs which have to be dealt with. They should be asked to fill in the necessary details in their contour maps what the lecturer is doing on the black-board or even pointing so on the map.

The reason why most of the candidates fail to achieve a very high standard at the college stage is that they are not used to reading much for themselves. They depend far too much on class lectures, which cannot always be too detailed and comprehensive. They go out of the college without having any historical training and without learning to think for themselves. Their curriculum may have provided them a lot, but their minds will remain as sheets of blank paper with a few marks on them which will be effaced before long.

There is one other suggestion I wish to make. We have talked a good deal about the curriculum, and we hope for a more suitable one than the one we have at present. But always bear in mind that even the best of curricula could be throttled by bad teaching and a still worse system of examination. Though it does not fall within the province of a conference like this, I wish to make a suggestion that we should have an association of teachers of history in the province who should meet every year and discuss problems of practical importance. A conference like this cannot do everything, and there is much that could be done by ourselves meeting every year.

Mr. Daula—Mr. President and gentlemen, I have heard every one here discussing the Intermediate and the B.A. courses; but excepting the last speaker, no one has tried to sympathise with the Matriculation students.

I have been teaching in Sialkot for seven years, and now, on going to Hoshiarpur, I find that there is all the difference between earth and heaven in the type of students that one has to teach there and here. For instance, a Matriculation candidate translates "*Wuh jata hai*" as "He is goes"—what can you expect from boys who cannot render such a simple sentence into correct English? How can they be expected to understand their history text-books written in a difficult language. So the teacher of history has a double duty to perform; namely, to teach the boys history as well as English by translating passages into the vernacular. The teaching of history suffers on this account; and the syllabus cannot be covered within the period fixed by the University. I believe the present syllabus is far too lengthy for our lads of the M. and S.L.C. standard.

It was suggested by some one that English history should be totally abolished in the M. and S.L.C. examination. I do not at all agree with this proposal, for it would make the work of history teachers in the F.A. more difficult. It is necessary that Matriculation students should get an elementary knowledge of the

history of England. Might I suggest that, if English history is to be included in the M. and S.L.C. curriculum, it should be in the form of simple tales describing different dynasties and periods or explaining the growth of the English nation in different centuries ?

In order to enable the students to get a better understanding of Indian history, we need to emphasise different periods, comparing one with another, pointing out the growth and development of political power, together with the religious, social and constitutional changes made during the period, such as contributions made by the British in these particular lines from 1857 to 1921.

In our curriculum of Indian history, special stress should be laid on the study of heroes and heroines with a view to inspire our boys and girls. Another way to make the study of Indian history more interesting and attractive would be to prescribe, for rapid reading, tales translated into Urdu from Sleeman's *Travels*, thus giving to our boys and girls an idea of the society of those days and an opportunity to think and reflect.

We should not forget at the same time that we have a great deal to do in geography too. The syllabus in geography designed for the M. and S.L.C. is well thought out and very carefully prepared, being suitable to the standard. It is lengthy enough to keep the candidate busy for two years.

In short, our aim in teaching should be to make the student, brainy men, instead of "mere memory glands." In other words, we, as teachers, should try to make our boys think more, and not tax their memory. And this can only be done by curtailing the present curriculum in English history, spending more time and leisure on written exercises.

As regards the Intermediate (F.A.) I agree with some of the speakers that English history is felt to be very difficult, especially by the boys of the mufassal colleges. The cream of the boys goes to the Lahore Colleges, while the mufassal colleges have to be content with the residue. That is a practical difficulty which

we are facing to-day. I suggest, therefore, that from the Intermediate students a very high standard should *not*, as suggested by some of the speakers, be expected.

English history is optional and the text-books prescribed (such as Mowatt's and Smith's History of England) are big and voluminous, and far too difficult for our boys to follow. I would like to suggest that, just as important topics are laid down for the F.A. course in Mathematics, Economics and Philosophy, similarly a suggested outline be made in English history for the guidance of teachers and taught. If this is done, I believe it will facilitate the work of the teachers to a considerable extent who, while teaching, will try to unify various periods of English history by relating them together instead of giving the students a mass of unrelated facts from day to day. This is the only way to make the teaching of history more interesting and efficient in our high schools and colleges.

L.-Col. H. L. O. Garrett—Only for a moment, Mr. President and gentlemen. There was in ancient China an interesting form of punishment known as lien-chi, the cutting into a thousand and one pieces. We have listened for these two days to this process of lien-chi and the blood-stained pieces of the curriculum are thrown all over the room. In that work of butchery we have been so busy that we have entirely forgotten the most important suggestion, which was referred to by Mr. Hervey at a very early stage of the discussion, in regard to the existing Honours course. The course for the Honours school should differ entirely from that for the Pass course, and the importance of a separate Honours school on the lines of those existing in science has been overlooked. I rise to emphasise this necessity, which seems to be most important, amidst the general assassination of history books which has been going on here.

Dr. A. P. Newton—The effect that has been produced upon an outsider by this prolonged process of torture, as Mr. Garrett put it, is quite interesting and I can sum it all up in about one

sentence. Do not be too ambitious. You are not going to pour into your pupil all the information concerning history at the Matriculation stage or the Intermediate or the B.A. or even at the M.A. stage. It is only an approach to history. What you want to pour into the pupil is really a bit of historical insight, if I can put it that way, a little bit of feeling that things were not always as they are, but that they have grown into that position. You have in fact to implant in the minds of your students, at any stage, even at the school stage, a little bit of the historical sense. In some minds that historical sense will grow and become an important part of the student's equipment. In other minds which have tendencies in other directions it will hardly grow. It will be strangled. Generally speaking—I say this with all sincerity—if the teacher possesses some of that historical sense himself, he will be able to implant some seeds in the minds of the students at whatever stage they may be.

One or two suggestions about teaching have been made that are really very vital indeed, and I will bear them in mind. The suggestion that it is necessary just as much to have historical specialists and special schools as you have in Natural Science is one that is really commendable. In England we have been fighting along the same lines, and we have now won the battle. Financial circumstances and the difficulties of supply have prevented it from being universal, but in every English school worth the name to-day, there is an historical specialist. It is the demand for these historical specialists that gives you the men who wish to take research degrees or post-graduate courses in the Universities. That demand is an almost insatiable one, and it is one which is stretching to every part of the Empire. It is being realised more and more that, if you are to get really good progressive results from the teaching of a subject you must have someone whose interest is primarily in the subject which he is going to teach. He must be a good teacher, of course, he must be an inspiring and elevating personality; but, unless his main love is a love of history in the broad sense, including a necessary amount of geography,

unless you have that kind of man, you are very unlikely to get the right sort of teacher.

The other suggestion was made that you should have meetings from time to time of the people engaged in teaching the subject where they might take counsel together not about historical points or disputed historical information, but take counsel together as to how their teaching should be carried on, how to infuse through history a civic sense, sociological leanings and a scientific view of the growth of the community. That should be added on as an appendix to a discussion on similar lines on a smaller scale within the walls of the colleges of the University. That was a very practical suggestion. I am fortunate enough to be one of the early members of the Historical Association in England. We do not call it the English Historical Association, because its activities are not confined to England, but we call it the Historical Association pure and simple. I am now one of its vice-presidents and a pretty regular attendant at the Council meetings. The association groups together all the people interested in the teaching of history right from the Universities down to the elementary schools, including the training colleges, the secondary schools and the great public schools. We meet there on a footing of equality, and the association includes many thousands of members. Its meetings are exceedingly well attended in various centres throughout the country and also in certain dominions, and in its journal, the journal called *H story*, which is published quarterly, we have a forum for the discussion of the teaching of our subject. Thus contributions are circulated that are of definite practical value to the history teachers. That journal, which began as a gift to the association and to the public generally from the professed historians, is run on a voluntary basis. It is carried on under voluntary editorship by an editorial board, and though not a penny is paid for any contribution that has been made to the journal, it has taken its place to-day among the most important historical journals of the world. History is available for you to consult, for copies of it can be found in

the University Library, and certain gentlemen in Lahore are also members of the Historical Association. I can see many reasons for, and I cannot see any reason against, the foundation of something like the Historical Association in the Punjab, an historical association which at a later stage could be affiliated to the association in London, as the association in Ceylon has recently been affiliated. You can make available to your members all the leaflets which are circulated (about six leaflets a year) on different aspects of history. We also circulate an annual summary of historical literature and, for those who pay a higher subscription, we supply the quarterly journal.

The difficulties that are facing the teachers in the mufassal colleges are in some ways more acute than those here in Lahore. They are of a different sort. I can assure you, gentlemen, who are teaching in Lahore, that it is my sincere view that you are very lucky in that you have a real University centre, with an admirable equipment, such equipment as is rarely to be found in towns of the same magnitude. Your great public library, your archives, your University Library, in all these you have an admirable equipment and you have got a sufficient body of teachers to have the clash of mind against mind, and thus, a very active centre in which the study of history can be developed. But the teachers in the mufassal are not in that happy position. They are somewhat isolated. They have comparatively few persons with whom to discuss professional subjects. But bit by bit I am sure that a great many of your difficulties will be solved if you could have local centres of such an historical association as I have outlined meeting not too frequently but, from time to time, as we do in England. You ought to be able to get practically every history teacher, from all the regions round you, together not to discuss controversial points about history, nor to listen to the reading of papers, but to pool your knowledge, pool your difficulties and take common counsel together as to how they may be solved. I am inclined to think that the man who leads, the man who originates the movement, will probably have to take

a large share in running the association. I am sure he will personally get nothing out of it, but he ought not to look for anything at all. What he should want to do is the social service of helping his weaker brethren to raise their standard of teaching, and to come into that happy fold where you can take a real intellectual interest in the forwarding of your subject. By centralisation of effort here, by the establishment of a historical association in Lahore, with centres in the several cities of the province, where you have an Intermediate college or a college training for the degree, I feel that you will be doing a great deal to elevate the general standard of teaching in the subject throughout the province. You will find thus a piece of work that is thoroughly worth while, and you will be advancing that spread of an historical sense which is one of the great needs in India at the present day.

Turning from that—after all it is a most casual suggestion that I have made, although it lies outside the scope of this conference—let us turn to the actual curriculum itself. Mr. Garrett was quite right in saying that the Honours work is perhaps rather unfamiliar to those who teach in some of the colleges here and in the Intermediate colleges outside. I am inclined to think that the equipment of even a degree college in the mufassal is hardly ample enough to have many Honours schools attached to it. The problem of the Honours degree affects mainly the colleges in the centre, and I am going to say nothing about it. I cannot speak of the Matriculation, for after all it is not a University examination, but only an examination prior to entering the University. But, with reference to the other examinations, the Intermediate and the Pass B.A., I am quite sure that it is no use being too ambitious. Let us do what we do very well. Don't let us attempt to think that we have got to infuse into everyone at each stage all the details of Indian and other history. In my view—I merely give it to you for what it is worth—if you take three simple requirements and satisfy these three at the intermediate stage, you can have very much more satisfactory

results than you could otherwise have. And the three requirements are these. For my own part I would have the same subjects set both at the Intermediate and the final stage. For the B.A., you would study the subjects in greater detail, but still they would be the same subjects. These three subjects would be, (1) the general history of India, the study becoming more and more intensive as you get down to the times when there is more historical material. Secondly, the history of England especially of the particular institutions which are of interest to India. For instance, I do not think that in India you need to study the English Reformation or English Ecclesiastical History as we must in England, but you do need to know the growth of Parliament. Lastly, I am quite sure you need to know something of world history, but in that world history do not attempt to begin with the earliest periods, for we really know very little of their history. Do not trouble your students at the beginning of their course with far distant ages or accounts of the early discoveries of Sumeria or Chaldea. We hardly know them ourselves, and archaeological discoveries do not necessarily give us history. Begin detailed study somewhere about the middle, the period of the Renaissance, when the European nations have appeared in their modern form. The students should know something of Greece and Rome and their contributions to modern history, and be able to link it up with the Europe of modern times. Their study will be very cursory at first, but become more and more intensive at each stage till they come to times approaching the present. That is practical politics.

You can deal with history teaching on these broad, general lines in any college or school without very expensive equipment, but you must have some apparatus with which to do your work. Do not be content to acquiesce supinely in the claim that is put forward too frequently by teachers of Natural Science, that they alone have a right to purchase apparatus, and that Arts departments ought to be satisfied if they are provided merely with class-rooms and desks. One of the speakers said, and said very rightly, that you

cannot study History any more than Natural Science without the proper equipment for it. Of all the teachers in a school or in a college, the teacher who is the person interested most in the library is the history teacher, for that is his laboratory, and books, maps and documents are his re-agents. Buy what books you can, buy them carefully, and buy them with the advice of the specialists at the centre. Come into Lahore to see the books in the University Library before you make up your lists. But keep on buying. Allow complete access to the books to your students. Encourage them not to read any particular text-book. But to read all that they can get hold of. Then they will realise the truth that historical truth is many-sided. They will get a taste for reading, and they will duly acquire something of that historical sense which I have been describing.

An admirable idea was brought forward by one of the speakers that you should teach some of the tales of history. That is being done to a very large extent in English schools. Don't attempt always to get a connected chronological story. Give some amount of attention to a period of any ten years here and another there; for after all, history is a thing that goes by jerks given to the people who have played an important part. Get them interested in personalities in history. By encouraging that kind of feeling, and not by attempting to be too ambitious of covering the whole field, with all its details, you will make the study one of living interest to your pupils, which it will never be if you follow the old-fashioned lines of names, dates, facts and events.

The general impression that I have derived from this discussion is not a pessimistic one. It has been very cheering to hear time and again coming from people teaching in far distant parts and somewhat isolated places sound ideas concerning historical teaching. I do not think there is any very drastic remedy required for the curriculum of your University. You do not have to apply the process of torture to which Mr. Garrett referred, for I think the patient needs only a mild dose, and it needs to be suggested to him that he is not going to get well by drinking all the contents of the physician's

dispensary. All that he wants to do is to simplify things, and to do that is to accomplish something real, which could be achieved here, there and everywhere.

When we come to the M.A., we get into a different field altogether. In the Honours course you arrive at a position where it is necessary to correlate the studies with those of other Universities. To add extra papers on the Pass course is not to take a man through the Honours course. You may call it Honours as much as you like, but it is not, in the sense in which the term is universally understood. To say that a man has taken the Honours course, implies that a man has specialised in a particular subject, that he has laid aside other subjects and can lay claim to some expert knowledge of his chosen field. So long as you tack on your Honours to your Pass examination, you are not going to get into that field at all, and it is impossible for a person coming from another university to discuss Honours with you. But, if you grant that you will have a specialised school, you can really undertake some teaching of advanced history.

Here again I think that you should have in mind only three elements to constitute the curriculum. I would allow the Honours student a variety of options, but still I would keep my general line of division. I should include Indian history, the history of the British Empire and European history, that European history being infused largely with some study of the history of the East. Within these limits I would allow a man options, but even there I would not allow him too wide a choice. I do not think any practically minded man would encourage Indian students at the B.A. Honours stage to take up the detailed study of the history of Greece and Rome. Even in the University of London, and in many of the newer English Universities, we do not find a large proportion of students specialising in Ancient History. The proper place for any one taking to that study is to go to the ancient Universities like Oxford and Cambridge, where he must work at it along with the advanced study of the classical languages.

Leaving that aside, there are certain options which, I think, you may properly allow. You can allow the student to specialise in Ancient or Mediæval Indian History or even Modern Indian History with propriety. I think you should allow some to turn their attention to the growth of culture in the East, while some will go to the cultures of the modern world. Some minds will instinctively turn to a more extended study of some branch of history, such as the general history of the East. By that I do not necessarily mean only the Asiatic countries, but include some study of Egypt, of the spread of Arabic culture, of North Africa, and certainly you should have some study of the Byzantine Empire. It is practically very difficult to cover such a vast course, but probably only a few would take it. It is here that you will come into contact with the Oriental colleges, the teachers of which are engaged in a study of your classics.

Added to these three elements then, we should have, as we have in London, something of the study of the history of political ideas because that would infuse all historical study with a new spirit. It is there that you help the student to get from the realm of facts to the realm of abstract ideas. If then you have these four obligatory elements in your Honours curriculum: (1) Indian History, including the history of the East, (2) English or British History especially in relation to the History of the Empire, (3) European History, especially bearing on its contact with the outer world of Asia, and (4) a study of the History of Political Ideas, with a certain amount of required reading in the great political writers like Hobbes, Rousseau, Montesquieu and so on, you would be getting a very educative Honours course at this stage.

I would recommend, if you would take it up, the classification of the successful candidates at the B.A. Honours examination. It is of very great importance in all English Universities. There are in some Universities three classes, in others four; but the lower classes are not regarded as conferring any particular distinction. The first class is very highly valued and the second commands respect. The best men you will get will attain a first, but

their numbers are few, and most good men get a second. If I may advise you here, do not attempt to put your degree candidates in an order of merit, for it has been our universal experience that you cannot do it satisfactorily. Our Universities have found that you can say with considerable accuracy whether a particular candidate is of first class standard or of the second, but beyond that you cannot adjudicate, for minute differences of marking often depend on accident. They hang too much on the caprice of an examiner; and, whether he is feeling well or otherwise, while he is marking, whether the candidate has found questions congenial to him, and so on.

Put the candidates, therefore, only in classes, and let those in each class be arranged only in alphabetical order. Having done that, you will find that there are some choice spirits not only in the first class, but also high in the second, who have proved that they possess the gift of the historical sense. Those are the people we are searching for, the little cream that will come to the top throughout the whole range of their studies. After all it is upon them that you must rely to leaven the whole. It is among these people that you will find your University teachers of the future, and it is they who should be helped on towards the higher degrees of the post-graduate course.

We come last to a few suggestions that I have to make about the M.A. degree. I am strongly of the opinion that only those who have taken B.A. Honours in history should be accepted as candidates for the higher degree in history. These men should be permitted, I think, to take either of two lines. A few of them, very few exceptional people who have the historical sense, developed to such a high extent that their teachers can be certain of it, should be permitted to take their M.A. by real original research. But there are numbers of men who would like to derive the benefit of a further intensive training for the M.A., and would benefit by it. Looking at the circumstances of the University of the Punjab, while it appears necessary that such training should be a research training, it need not necessarily be research training in unpublished

material. It might well be a carefully planned research training in select historical materials. This is a matter in which I have had considerable experience and about which I have written in the introduction to the first volume of my "Select Documents relating to the Unification of South Africa." I have there explained my reasons for taking up that subject. The documents were prepared several years ago, and with them I have succeeded in training a good many people, of whom some have later gone on to do valuable original work. I am speaking, therefore, in the light of considerable experience.

You want your post-graduate students to become practically entirely absorbed in their subject to the exclusion of other interests, and you cannot do that profitably unless you provide them with materials to work upon that are in an accessible form. The post-graduate student must be encouraged to study intensively some narrow field of history in which he is especially interested. Therefore, give him the option of taking up as his particular subject any subject which is congenial to his nature. Then give him a select mass of historical material, extending to 2,000 or 2,500 pages of printed documentary matter. Let him find in those pages problems which require solution and let him make a history out of them. Let him feel the clash of his mind upon that of others, and at the end of his course, examine him thoroughly so as to find his capabilities. Do not put up with giving him papers on the special subjects that he has prepared. But set him problems which he could never have heard of and see how he handles them. Give him all the materials in his examination hall. Let him have his tools in front of him, and let him use those tools upon the unknown problem and get a solution out of them just as a chemist is set to work to analyse an unknown mixture. Finally, after he has accomplished this, examine him *viva voce* to test his real historical capacity. That again should not be a mere testing, a mere determination whether he has attained a particular standard and satisfied this, that or the other test. But you can easily make it an educative part of the student's course as all examinations ought to be. I

have always been in the habit of telling my students not to fear their examinations. They come at the end of a course as just an essential stage within it. I have often seen how some of my students have been looking forward in high spirits to their examinations, and it is most gratifying to see the ablest of them examining their examiners on such occasions. In the *viva voce* examination it is very interesting to see students hitting back at their examiners and arguing about the points that have been raised.

Thus ranging from the Intermediate, where you may have a thousand students in any examination, we should have only a few dozens left at the B.A. Honours stage, and, even out of these, only a few, very few, will come naturally up to the post-graduate stage ; the best work is done only by these few. Nevertheless, these few people are those in whom their teachers will take the greatest pride, for, as I have said, they will be the little leaven which will leaven the whole.

The whole problem is thus one, right from the bottom, when you begin students at the Intermediate, up to the point where you can get the best men in the centre here—there is only one aim, only one desire, and that is to implant in your pupils' minds an historic sense. Encourage the growth of that plant, and, once it is beginning to grow, it is certain that you will have others who will implant the seeds in their generation. It is not an impracticable problem here in the Punjab for you have here the possibilities for good historical work. If only you will cease to be too ambitious in prescribing this option, and that and the other, if you will only pursue simple definite lines till you get to the top of the tree, you may be quite sure that you will be establishing the reputation of the Punjab University among the Indian Universities even higher than it is at present. (*Cheers.*)

The conference re-assembled at 12-30.

Chairman—We have now come to the last subject before us. As I have said before, here in Lahore, you are very lucky in that you possess a great mass of historical material. In the first

place, in the Record Office you possess some valuable documents to which Mr. Garrett is going to refer, dealing with the history of the Punjab in the 19th century, not only in the British but in the pre-British period as well. The other day I was shown in one of the colleges here a mass of material believed to contain no historical matter, but only literary and moralising features ; but I feel sure if you only examine it thoroughly, there might be existing fragments of material relating to the various regimes that have flourished in this city. Mr. Garrett is going to tell you what is contained in the Record Office, and I hope you will get into your minds the desire, the interest to retrieve and get together all the historical materials that exist within the province in the hope that, some day or other, it will be possible to compose the history of this province and the history of the vicissitudes through which it has gone on a real historical basis, on documentary material, and, not merely on traditions and chronicles. So while listening to the Keeper of the Archives, let us have the ambition that some day we may have these materials collected together and placed at the disposal of the writer of history.

I call upon Mr. Garrett to deliver his address.

THE PUNJAB RECORDS AS SOURCES OF INVESTIGATION.

Lt.-Col. H. L. O. Garrett—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I find that there are many people here who know a great deal about the records I am going to deal with to-day, and at the same time I find that there are still others who know very little about them.

I wish just to explain the circumstances under which I was led to turn my mind to these records. Some six years ago, when looking for material for my post-graduate students, I approached the old tomb of Anarkali in the Secretariat. There I came on a mass of material, some of which had been arranged and some not, and the whole thing was in a very neglected condition. Some years before a few men had been put on special duty on them and they had done a certain amount of work in sorting the papers and classifying

them. But, since they cost money, Government paid them off, and there the work lay in an unfinished state. There was no one to look after the papers and they followed the usual fate of many valuable collections of old documents, and were covered with white ants and in a very dirty state. I remember the first day subsequently, when I went there for certain papers which were in an almirah in one corner, and I had to move two tables and five spare commodes to get at them. I then approached Sir Edward Maclagan and asked him if I could put the whole thing in order. As my offer included no request for payment, it was readily accepted and Government said they would be only too pleased. I then acted in an unofficial capacity, and after a time found that this was not possible as the Secretariat generally regarded my presence with grave suspicion. I had no status, and the superintendents of the main building eyed me with a biliary eye. I, therefore, applied to Government to have myself put on a regular status, and the result was that I got official recognition of my position as the Keeper of the Records, a kind of departmental head with a right to give orders to a staff of my own, and at the same time a small honorarium for the work. I then proceeded to organise my staff and set myself at what I have endeavoured to do during the last few years, to build up a school of historical research.

Dr. Newton has already told you in his remarks what a hopeful future there is for original research here, and he has also mentioned the fact that it is only the very best men who should be allowed to work on unpublished documents. Hitherto, we have been allowing all M.A. students to work on them; and, unless a drastic change comes in the future, that will continue. The fruit of our labours is seen in this fact that I have now permission from Government to publish, under my general editorship, a few theses prepared for the M.A., which I considered of sufficient importance to merit publication. At least two of the authors are in the room at present ; Mr. Sarkar who has written his monograph on the history of the Grand Trunk Road, and Mr. Daya Kishen, who has written on the history of a section of the Judiciary in the province. So far,

four monographs* have appeared as emanating from the Record Office, one on the Grand Trunk Road, two on the History of the Judiciary in this province and the fourth is a brochure of mine on the History of the Police. There is another one under preparation on a curious subject, but still worth publishing, the history of lunacy and the administration of mental hospitals in the province which goes so far back as to Dr. Honigberger. That is the work that is going on at the present moment, and there are eight or nine men working on all sorts of subjects.

Then, as to what materials there are. Here again, I am talking to many people who know what there are, but I am only addressing those who do not know. The building may be divided into two sections : first, the section upstairs, which you may dismiss at once as being more modern and not likely to be used at present. I may here say that Government have committed an unpardonable sin, because they have destroyed the whole of the originals, keeping only printed copies. So far as I can see, the Punjab is not the only sinner, but the Government of India and other provinces have done similarly; so that India, alone of all countries in the world, is the country which destroys the originals. Downstairs, however, we have the originals, and those, being under my own eye, are not likely to suffer destruction. What have we here ?

First of all, there are the political journals of the various political officers kept in the early days from the Sutlej treaty (1809) down to the annexation of the province (1849). Part of these have been printed, but there is still work to be done on others. There is correspondence from the various agents, for it will be remembered that, in the days when the British power was coming up to the Sutlej, they had political residents in Lahore, who corresponded with the frontier agency. These are all bound in book-form in original letters, and there is material for original work there. Among them, there is particularly one group of papers to which I referred the other day : the political officers' letters relating to the First Afghan War, an examination of which will surely neces-

* Since then 4 more have been published (Ed.)

sitate a rewriting of the history relating to that episode. As regards the accessibility to these papers, the whole of them have been press-listed only, and at the end of last year I completed my lists of the 45 years of press-listing that I set out to do six years ago. We have now completed press lists, and the last, the 27th volume, will go to the Press shortly. Any one who wishes to consult these papers has only to get hold of the press list, where details, such as the person writing the letter, the person to whom it is written and a gist of the letter itself are given in full. All these lists have been collected and are available for the student to work upon. Then there are various departmental papers relating to the post-annexation days, many of which will furnish material for little monographs on the history of various institutions such as the ones to which I have recently alluded. The history of the Marine Department, sketching the vanished naval power of the Punjab, was to be written, and the papers are all there. There are many other departmental papers which can be dealt with in the same way.

Another very big section to be dealt with is the Mutiny period. The story of the Mutiny has been told before, but there are many aspects of that episode which have not been dealt with and may be written by a study of these papers. There are lying there, for example, accounts of local mutinies in different places, all of which are extremely interesting and have never been published. I took out one the other day when I was in the confidential section—I may here state that, though it is the rule in England to keep papers confidential for 50 years, in this case the first 25 years of the confidential section could be thrown open—I came across a mass of interesting letters containing statements made by news-writers and people about that time, giving an entirely new version of the siege of Lucknow. I wonder if any of you have read that one of the sons of the King of Oudh was in Lucknow at that time; at any rate I came across the fact for the first time. I have been acting as a modest Hercules in cleaning these stables, and I have put them in order and they are in an accessible form now.

There is another very important section, the Sikh papers. That work was turned out by Mr. Sita Ram. These papers used to be in the Persian Secretariat in a filthy condition when Mr. Sita Ram, before he became a member of the staff of the Government College, was placed on special duty to work on them. As a specimen, I may mention there are the papers of Raja Dina Nath, the Minister of Ranjit Singh. They contain a complete collection of military, civil and revenue papers of the period of Ranjit Singh. These papers have been removed to my charge now. In two volumes, Mr. Sita Ram found in many places there were a lacunæ. As a matter of curious chance, M. Zafar Hassan, at the Fort, whom you met the other day, happened to come upon a box of papers one day within the Fort. At my instance, they were sent to me, and on examination, we were able to fill those gaps and complete the series. On further examination of these papers, we found they were the papers of Misar Beli Ram, who was incharge of the Toshakhana during the reign of Ranjit Singh. Mr. Jagat Singh has been put on special duty for two years to do research on these documents.

These, then, are the materials available. There is one matter on which I should say a few words just to impress upon you what Dr. Newton has already said. The late Governor, Sir Malcolm Hailey, who was a very kind supporter of the Record Office and of historical investigation, again and again came forward with valuable suggestions. One of them resulted in a small museum being attached to the office. We acquire historical pictures and buy also books and interesting historical papers that come into the market. Sir Malcolm Hailey further came forward with a suggestion, which I followed up, that we should address the Deputy Commissioners of the districts and ask them, when they came upon any old family within their jurisdiction who possessed such documents as might be of historical importance, to send them up here. Mr. Sita Ram Kohli, who is in charge, examines them, and if they are found to be so valuable as to deserve reproduction, we reproduce them by the photo-stat process, and send the originals back with a

photo-stat copy. The private owner of papers is a very shy bird and very often won't talk about it. But still if we go on in this way, we hope to get good material. That is one way in which you gentlemen, who dwell far from Lahore, could help us. I have already addressed certain colleges about it. In Rawalpindi, for instance, there should be a good lot of material. If, in any centre, and if you are not allowed to inspect the records (and I think after the circular which has gone to the Deputy Commissioners, there should be no such trouble), please write to me about it, and I will take steps for obtaining facilities. By this means, we have got so far mainly firmans of the Moghul days. We have specimens of nearly all. The most valuable bundle came from the Jhelum District the other day, containing one hundred and thirty-two letters, nearly all of them written by Chattar Singh, the Sikh general at Chillianwala, and these are now being examined by Mr. Jagat Singh. As soon as that is finished, it is hoped that they will throw new light on some aspects of the Second Sikh War. If one private family could furnish a bundle of such historical importance, I am sure there are many others that could be explored in the same way.

I have told you what materials there are. It is not as in olden days, when you had so much trouble in groping through them. You have them all collected and ready for reference, and with the aid of the small reference library which I have succeeded in getting, you could be doing very useful work. If that is not sufficient, you have a fine library, one of the finest public libraries in the whole of India which is always accessible to you. If there is the spirit for the work much could be achieved.

After recording its thanks to the University, the Chair, and the Government for agreeing to publish the proceedings, the Conference adjoined.

EUROPEAN ADVENTURERS IN THE PUNJAB.

A notable feature of the Conference was the series of public lectures delivered in the University Hall on each of the three evenings of the Conference session.

The first lecture, at which the Hon'ble Sir Shadi Lal, Chief Justice of the High Court of the Punjab, presided, was delivered by Lt.-Col. H. L. O. Garrett, Principal of Government College, Lahore. The second lecture, under the presidency of Sir Geoffrey deMontmorency, Governor of the Punjab, was delivered by Dr. Arthur Percival Newton, President of the Conference.* The third of the series was delivered by A. C. Woolner, Esq., M.A., Vice-Chancellor of the University of the Punjab, Sir Abdul Qadir, Kt., being in the Chair.

President—Ladies and gentlemen, The lecturer of this evening is well-known to you all and does not stand in need of any introduction from me. He has made a special study of the subject which he has selected for his discourse to-day, and I am sure you will find it very interesting. I call upon Lieutenant-Colonel Garrett to deliver his lecture.

Lieutenant-Colonel Garrett—“My Lord, the Chief Justice, Ladies and Gentlemen, The subject that I have chosen to-night, namely, European Adventurers in the Punjab, is a subject on which I and my collaborator, Mr. Grey, have done a good deal of work during the last six years. Since Compton wrote his book on European adventurers some years ago, no particular work dealing with this matter has appeared. And Compton's book is out of date now, because many new facts have come to light since it was written, which we have been able to incorporate in our recent researches. What I am going to give to-night is more or less a summary of some of the work which we have done, the whole of which will appear in book form. The book is just going to Press, and I propose giving you to-night just a few details of some of the adventurers who figured in the history of Northern India at the end of the 18th century and in the first half of the nineteenth. If I were asked to put date limits, to what I am going to say to-night, I would put them roughly from 1781 down to 1844 or possibly 1848. I say 1844 because that was the year in which there was a wholesale sweeping out by the anarchic government, which succeeded that of Ranjit Singh, of the European adventurers in the employ

* Professor Newton's lecture formed the first of a series of six public lectures delivered by him during his stay in Lahore. Hence it is not printed as a part of the Proceedings of the Conference.—(Ed.)

in the Punjab, and 1781 because I just want to include a brief mention of that rather interesting figure, George Thomas. Now, the greater men, the better known men, like George Thomas, have already their biographers. Franklin wrote a life of Thomas, and there is a short sketch of him by Gabrielle Festing in her book "Strangers within the Gates."

George Thomas hailed from Tipperary long before Tipperary was discovered by the British Army, and he made his way to the north of India by devious routes. He deserted and entered the service of a number of different Indian rulers. I am not going to give the details because they are set out in Franklin. But I am merely coming to where he impinges on the history of the North. Ultimately he set up for himself an independent kingdom in the district round Hansi. He coined his own money, specimens of which can still be seen with a rough T on them, and for a time he ruled from his capital, George Garh, as an independent sovereign. He went so far as to contemplate the invasion of the Punjab, and he had actually set out on that invasion when intrigue against him in his own kingdom forced him to retire. His scheme was never carried out, and his kingdom fell to pieces and he ultimately died a broken man. But it is very interesting to speculate what might have happened had George Thomas carried out his scheme of invasion. Long before the Sikh army had been really organised, as it was later, as we shall see, on European lines, and when the army in the Punjab was a mere collection of broken, disunited and undisciplined forces, George Thomas had a small, highly trained and highly loyal body of men round him, and it is just possible that had he not been obliged to retire, he might have anticipated the later annexation which took place as you know in the forties.

I pass on from George Thomas to a consideration of the adventurers who really served and worked in the Punjab. And my audience is so familiar with the salient facts of Punjab history that I need only remind it of one or two facts. We all know of the rise to power of the great Maharaja Ranjit Singh. We date that rise from his acquisition of Lahore in 1799 from Ahmad Shah

Durrani, the then ruler of Lahore. His kingdom rapidly spread. It spread to the south and then across the Sutlej, and there he came into contact with the British. Lord Lake had pushed the British power up to Delhi in 1803 taking the blind Emperor Shah Alam under his protection. When the British advance had spread as far as Ludhiana on the banks of the Sutlej, the ruler of the Sikh kingdom came into conflict with the forces of the Company, though not exactly into conflict, because at a very early stage Ranjit Singh was impressed with what was going on and formed a very high opinion of the fighting ability of the forces of the British, which he subsequently confirmed by a private visit to the camp where he saw for himself the advantages of the western discipline and training. And from that time he made up his mind that he would train his army upon the lines which he had seen. Hence arose the demand for European trainers and instructors. And they came from all classes. At the one end you have deserters very often drunken, worthless persons, people like Matthew O'Brien and at the other, you have scholarly soldiers, gentlemen like Court or Masson. Ranjit Singh paid a flat rate for those people who would desert and come to his service. They are of two classes. There are the non-British, who came in by several routes—we will deal with them in due course—and occupied positions of importance; and there are deserters who were induced by Ranjit Singh and who had incurred a distaste for life in the British army. In those days you remember life was very hard. There was no Y. M. C. A., and no Soldiers' Institutes, and there was no means of amusement if there was no fighting going on. Life was hard, discipline was brutal, and, when there was a prospect of Rs. 150 a month for a gunner and Rs. 80 for an infantryman, quite a steady stream of men left their regiments and made their way over the Sutlej where they took service under Ranjit Singh. It has been our business to try and trace as far as possible the careers of these men. Possibly, it may seem unnecessary, as some of them are quite unimportant, but we felt it our duty to make as complete a record as we could possibly prepare. For many of these deserters are

the progenitors of families who have stayed on in the Punjab till to-day and who at present are occupying comparatively humble positions in various walks of life.

We turn now from these general remarks to the better known men, and as first of these I would mention Jean Baptiste Ventura. Like many of these well-known men, he has already been the subject of a monograph. My predecessor, the President of the Historical Society, some years ago read a paper on him which was published. In this he goes into his career with some details, but a few points about him may be of interest. As regard the man's origin, he came from Modena in Italy. Wolff, the traveller, who was himself a Jew, states in the course of the book that he wrote upon his travels that Ventura was really a Jew, and that his full name was Reuben Bin Toora. But I do not think that this is in any way correct. Jean Baptiste does not seem particularly Judaic, nor does the portrait of Ventura exhibit any salient Jewish features. Further Ventura, according to another account, stated that a relation of his was a Papal secretary about that time. We attempted to trace this reference, but the Vatican was unable to help us at all. There was also for many years a Roman Catholic Father, called Ventura, working in the Punjab who may have been a relation of his. It is a common name and we need not press the matter further. Any way, Jean Baptiste was born in Modena and served in the Italian army and was believed to have gone to Russia with the expedition to Moscow. Recently we have been able to finally decide that point. The researches of my friend Dr. Chopra into the Punjab as a sovereign State have been published, and the author has unearthed an interesting letter from Dr. Murray in the secret consultations of the India Office. Dr. Murray, who was sent here to the Punjab to give medical assistance to Ranjit Singh, in the course of his account states that he met Ventura. In his conversation with Ventura, he gives him the news of Europe, and among other things he mentions to him that Eugene de Beauharnais, Napoleon's step-son, had died recently. Now, that step-son died in 1824 and this conversation took place in 1826. Ventura replied that he

was very sorry, indeed to hear that because he knew Beauharnais very well, that he had served under him in Russia, and that he was by far the most popular of all the French Generals. That leads us to a final decision on the point, for Beauharnais was selected by Napoleon to command the Italian contingent in that Moscow campaign. As is well known, Napoleon drew very heavily from his southern troops for the Moscow campaign. This is one of the reasons that explains the enormous mortality among his men, as the southern men could not stand the Russian cold, and they fared worse than the troops from the North. Ventura came here in 1822 along with another Frenchman, Allard, whom we shall talk of in a moment. He was employed by Ranjit Singh for a time in a civil capacity, and was given the governorship of Multan. He rose to the rank of a General and was placed in command of one section of Sikh troops. A very interesting old map which has recently come to light at Dehra Dun College, and which is now being photographed for our record office, shows Lahore in 1837 at the time of the visit of Sir Henry Fane, the Commander-in-Chief. It shows the distribution of European officers and their troops—Ventura's troops were more or less at the place where we are now. And for his headquarters, Ranjit Singh gave him what is now the Record Office. He lived there, and when he found it was too large for him and his family, Ranjit Singh built for him the present Secretariat buildings. One can identify the durbar hall in the centre in the outlines of the structure that one sees there at the present day. Ventura was very much a family man. He served Ranjit Singh and the Sikh Raj until after latter's death in 1844, when there was a general clearance. At this time he was one of those who disposed of his property in Lahore and retired. Having gone to Europe he fell on evil days, lost all his money and came back in 1848 to look into matters, because he had not disposed of all his property. Ranjit Singh had given him certain jagirs on the south side of the Sutlej, and these he left in the hands of the British for the benefit of his wife, an Armenian lady whom he had treated badly, for he married another wife in France. When he came back he

disposed of his holdings in Cis-Sutlej territory for £20,000 and went home with the money, leaving Madam Ventura in destitution in Ludhiana. She lived on a pension from the British Government and died in 1870 and is buried in Ludhiana cemetery. Ventura himself died in 1858. Last year we had an interesting sequel to his career, which shows how the present links up with the past in matters on record. His daughter had married into a French aristocratic family, and two years ago a descendant of hers declared that the British Government owed his family the value of these jagirs, *viz.*, £20,000, and asked them to kindly pay it up. The Government of India referred it to us, and we found Ventura's receipt for the money. The reply was sent back to the Marquis asking him to think again.

The next of the better-known men — and he again has had his life written—is Paolo di Avitabile, a Neapolitan. He was the subject of a great deal of research by the late Mr. Julian Cotton who was recently record-keeper in Madras and who wrote his life, which continues to be a very popular book and was translated into the Italian. Avitabile served in the Neapolitan army till February 1815. He may or may not have served in the French Army. It is not quite clear. He arrived in 1826 with another Frenchman, Court, of whom we shall talk in a moment, and was given a contingent of troops to command. His cantonment was at Naulakha, where the North-Western Railway carriage workshops now stand. He had a house on the top of a mound which used to be there in the days within the recollection of the older inhabitants of Lahore, but which has been swept away owing to the construction of the Railway workshops there. Avitabile's claims to fame are mainly in his civil capacity. In 1829, Ranjit Singh sent him as Governor of Wazirabad, and he remained there for six years till he was transferred to Peshawar in 1835. And the result of his Governorship is still to be seen, because Wazirabad is one of the best planned and laid-out towns of the Punjab. He drove streets through the town and made it more sanitary than he found it. On his transfer, he proceeded to Peshawar, then in

a highly disorderly state. It had always had a reputation for a lawless town, and in those days it was living up to it. It had not long before been acquired by the Sikhs, and it became a bone of contention between the Afghan and the Sikhs. It was a hot-bed of crime of all sorts. On his arrival at Peshawar, Avitabile proceeded at once to put up a triple gallows outside the town, and he saw to it that the gallows was rarely unoccupied, and by sheer brute force of character he kept Peshawar in order. He was the governor from 1835 to 1843, and we must not forget that, ruffian though he was in many ways, the British owed him a great debt for his attitude in the first Afghan War. We were committed to that unfortunate enterprise. Ranjit Singh was dead. The Durbar was anarchic or beginning to be anarchic, and British lines of communication between the south and Peshawar were very unsafe indeed. Had our lines of communication been cut through, there might have been disasters even worse than the retreat from Kabul. But Avitabile held his men down with an iron hand and insisted on keeping his bargain with the British army, and the British army was allowed to come back and so the situation was saved. I may mention here, that Kaye's history of the first Afghan War really needs re-writing. I suppose in his work Kaye may have seen a certain number of documents from the political office concerning Avitabile and his relations with the British, but undoubtedly he had not seen them all. And one of the works that remains to be done in the future is the checking of what we have in Lahore with what we have in London in the India Office. It is a pity that Fortescue in writing volume 12 of the History of the British Army, did not have access to our papers. It was a pity that he did not consult us as we might have been able to give him a great deal more material on that very interesting period. Avitabile saved the situation as we have seen, and like those whom we have mentioned, he too went off in the general dispersal. But, unlike many of those, he got away with an extremely good hand in the shape of money. It was very difficult to get money out of Ranjit Singh as he was fond of paying in kind, and would keep payments for

many months in arrears. However, Avitabile managed to get away with a lot, and with that money he retired to his own country, where he was treated with all honour. He was made a general in the Neapolitan army, and he was also made a general in the French army. He then proceeded to settle down in Naples. But he was not a very nice man. His domestic behaviour was such that he could not get on well, and it was suggested that he had better retire to the country, and so he went to his native place and proceeded to build for himself a fine house. His relations had their eye on his money, and apprehending that the money would go out of the family they selected one of his nieces, and by means of a papal dispensation she was married to the uncle, and having done that they then found that they had not gone far enough and wanted to precipitate matters. Avitabile had nearly completed his house when they disposed of him in 1850. He was first poisoned at his evening meal, and when that was not sufficiently efficacious, he was murdered by means of a charcoal brazier. So he passes out of history. His tombstone in Agerola bears a long and pompous inscription describing his various honours and degrees. He was invested with the Order of the Star of the Punjab which was inaugurated by Ranjit Singh in imitation of the European orders.

I have already spoken of Court as coming here with Avitabile. Now we will turn to his career. He was born in 1793 at Grasse on the Mediterranean, and he was a French officer of a good type. We have reasons to believe he fought at Waterloo. In 1818 finding the new regime intolerable, as so many of the old Napoleonic officers did, he retired from the army altogether and went abroad seeking his fortune. He heard from others that there was something doing in the Punjab and therefore he arrived here along with Avitabile in 1826. But before his arrival, he came overland as Avitabile had done, and his journey was a long and eventful one. The importance of that journey lies in the fact that being an educated officer he compiled on that journey a journal of his experiences. This account, known as Court's Journal

is exceedingly interesting and important and, to use a military phrase, it is in the nature of a route-book because he described with the eye of a soldier the routes and passes practical for artillery. Hence when the Government of India got hold of it—he gave it to them—they treated it as a highly confidential document and deposited it in the archives in the original French. There it lay for many years. It is now no longer confidential, and through the courtesy of the Government of India, we have been able to obtain a copy of it. It has been translated into English and attached as an appendix to our book which is under preparation. Court was an infantry-man but, for some unknown reason, Ranjit Singh put him more or less on special duty in connection with the artillery. Ranjit Singh had long realised the importance of the artillery, and Lord William Bentinck gave him some guns later on, which served as a model to the Sikh artillery. Some of you in the course of the visit to the Fort this morning will have seen specimens of them there. The artillery rapidly became an extremely efficient arm of the Maharaja's army. An old sketch in the Record Office shows the parading of the captured guns after the first Sikh War before the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and a glance at that picture which is presumably correct shows that the guns were of no mean type. I will not pursue the subject further because we all know that in the first Sikh War, the Sikh artillery worried the English army to no small extent. Court was then put on duty there, and he also had troops under him. As his residence, he was given the tomb of Nawab Nazrat Khan, which is at present lying hidden among a mass of railway workshops. Court retired with the others, and on his retirement he was honoured both by England and France. The French gave him the Legion of Honour and the British gave him a Fellowship of the Royal Asiatic Society and also of the Royal Geographical Society. He was generally a popular figure, and I should say that of all the European officers who came to Ranjit Singh, he was undoubtedly more of a gentleman than the others. He died in 1861.

The next is Jean Francois Allard, who was born at St. Tropez on the Mediterranean in 1785, joined the French army, fought in Spain, fought at Waterloo and then, like so many others, left the regular army and came abroad to seek his fortune. He arrived in 1822 and being a cavalry-man, Ranjit Singh gave him the duty of organising the cavalry. Of all the arms of his army, Ranjit Singh took the least interest in his cavalry, and he preferred to work with his irregular cavalry though he did attempt through Allard to raise some regiments of regular cavalry and these regiments were kept in what is now known as the Risala Bazaar. Allard worked here till 1835, and then he went on leave and came out again, one of the few to come back after leave during their service. When he came back he brought with him more equipment for his cavalry. Those of you who have been to the Fort this afternoon will have seen the breast-plates in the armoury. They are probably second-hand, but you will notice that they were brought out for the Sikh army. Allard brought some with him, while others were manufactured at the local factory. Allard did something else. He brought with him, when he came back from leave a letter from Louis Phillippe of France suggesting that he should act as French ambassador at the court of that monarch. But this was not at all to the taste of the British Government, and they made a fuss about it, and nothing more was ever heard about it. He died and was buried in Lahore in 1839. Barr in his journal gives an account of the very impressive funeral that took place. The body was brought in state from Peshawar and he was buried in Lahore. About the site of the grave, we have pretty well cleared up our doubt. He had already buried his little daughter, a baby of one year, on a mound in what we know now as the Kuri Bagh. In the corner of that area there is a green mound, and if you ascend to the top of that mound you find a small marble tombstone, the tombstone of Charlotte, his daughter. It seems pretty certain that he was buried somewhere near his daughter, because on the top of the mound near the daughter's grave there is an open space, and plenty of room for a full-grown person to have been buried, and

it seems almost certain that he was buried there. I have been hoping for sometime that the French authorities would put up a memorial tablet there in memory of one who was a soldier and a general. Of all the officers, he was Ranjit Singh's favourite. His death was not announced to Ranjit Singh for fear of the shock to the dying monarch.

These are the bigger men among the soldiers. We pass on now to the consideration of lesser men. Oms referred to in a letter published in Dr. Chopra's book was probably identical with a Spanish Jew who arrived here in 1827 and was put in command of a detachment of troops. He lived at Shahdara. He himself was given the mosque of Wazir Khan as his residence, and when he died of cholera, it was curiously reported that his death was a punishment for his act of sacrilege in having converted a mosque into a dwelling house. He was a great favourite of Ranjit Singh. As I have said, he died of cholera, and he was buried in Shahdara inside the compound. There are one or two places where he might possibly have been buried but we cannot say for certain where it was. Ranjit Singh was upset about it so much that he closed Shahdara for sometime afterwards.

We now come to a Prussian, one Mevius. He was in Ranjit Singh's service in 1827. He remained only for three years, because he endeavoured to introduce into the Sikh service the methods of the Prussian drill sergeant, and the Sikh troops did not take to it. On one occasion after he had been using the bullying methods to which he was used, the troops broke into a mutiny, and pursued him. He finally took refuge under the Maharaja's bed, and Ranjit Singh only pacified the troops by a promise that he would send him away, and so he disappears after a short residence here.

John Holmes is another interesting character. He was an Anglo-Indian. In those days, the only field open to an Anglo-Indian in the Army was that of a non-combatant, and they usually went into the band. This man was a trumpeter in the Bengal Artillery.

Playing the trumpet ceased to charm, and he deserted and came into Ranjit Singh's service. He proved a better colonel than a trumpeter. Ranjit Singh thought very highly of him. Not only he but various European officers with whom he came in contact speak of Colonel John Holmes as a worthy old gentleman, and they speak of him in terms of affection. He was the son of a Christian, but it seems doubtful that he was, as he pleads guilty to having three mothers and two wives. One of his mothers is buried in one of the oldest graves in the Lahore cemetery near the Taxali gate. Holmes was one of the group of men who never left the Punjab, because when the Sikh troops fell into an anarchic state after the death of Ranjit Singh, they were murdered by them. He was murdered in 1848 in Hazara by his troops, who would not listen to his appeal to do their duty, and breaking into mutiny, rushed into his tent and killed him.

Another name in my list is that of Richard Potter. Potter was a common deserter from the army, and he came as an instructor and rose to the rank of a colonel. He was one of the many who did not leave the Sikh service in 1844. The big men had cleared out and the lesser men remained. Potter fought against us in the first Sikh War. Ultimately he got away and remained in hiding in 1861 along with many others who remained in Lahore and whose descendants are still here to-day. But they are not very keen in talking about their ancestors and their performances at that time.

In Bahawalpur is the grave of Hamish McPherson, an officer formerly in the Black Watch, who entered the service of the Nawab of Bahawalpur and died fighting against the Sikhs in 1842. I make mention of the Nawab of Bahawalpur though he was an independent ruler, for that brings me to another point. One reason why it was extremely difficult to trace these people who had deserted and sought employment under Ranjit Singh was that Ranjit Singh, to avoid inconvenient questions by the British, who kept on writing to their political agents enquiring what had happened to this and that deserter, did not show such persons on his

list, but put them on that of Gulab Singh or of some other feudatory prince, and gave the reply to the British agent that he did not know of any such deserter.

Kanara is another of the same type as Richard Potter. Kanara is probably a corruption of the word Kennedy, and as far as we can see, Kanara was an Irish man named Kennedy who was a companion of the great Alexander Gardiner of whom we are going to hear in a moment. Kanara rose to the command of a regiment and was murdered by his troops. His descendants are living here at the present moment, and the late Deputy Commissioner Mr. O'Gilvie told me that he had arranged for a small pension for his grandson who was living here in a state of great indigence.

Russia supplies one name, that of Vieskenavitch who, was a great traveller. His importance lies in the fact that his story was stolen by Gardiner and used for Gardiner's own purposes.

I can prolong the list of these smaller men, but I think I will do well to pass on to others of more interest.

I now pass on to Mouton. He was an officer of the French army and possibly a relation of the other Mouton one of the younger among Napoleon's field generals, who fought at Waterloo. Mouton came here and never resigned his position in the French army. He was a cuirassier. There is a big picture in London showing the court of Ranjit Singh and his European officers, amidst whom Mouton appears in military costume, a tall figure with the French cuirassier uniform. He came out here and served in the Sikh army, fought against us at Sobraon, returned from leave, took up his position again in the French army and fought with us in the Crimea and finally died in 1867. The curious thing about him is that he should have spent his time in the Punjab apparently on leave from the French army.

Alexander Gardiner now claims our attention. Both myself and my collaborator are frank iconoclasts because we decline to be deceived by him as others have been. There are two versions of

his life at present before the public. In 1852 Gardiner contributed his own reminiscences to the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal and in 1898 his life was written by one Major Perse with a preface by Sir Richard Temple. It is rather curious to note in connection with his life how little our records were appreciated. At the time Major Perse wrote a letter to the Government asking them for information regarding Gardiner and the reply came : We have no information whatever. There is enough information about Gardiner to fill several bulky files, and yet in 1894 they were unaware of the fact that there was information here at all. Gardiner claimed to be all sorts of things in his own memoirs and in Perse's life, he is represented as a *chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*. He claimed to be an American born on the banks of the Colorado and educated in Mexico and to have a brother who was an engineer in Russia. The whole thing is nonsense. A study of the records shows that Sir Lepel Griffin had been familiar with Gardiner, when he retired to Kashmir, and the truth is that Gardiner was in the habit of telling all sorts of stories to different persons which when examined turned out to be stolen from the lives of other people. He stole from Court, he stole from Charles Masson extensively and from others, and he incorporated all this material into his travels which never took place. The real story of Gardiner is that he was an Irishman like George Thomas and he was a deserter. He came in 1831 and took service under Ranjit Singh as a colonel, and he had a great deal to do with the artillery. When Ranjit Singh died, the colonel stayed on as a kind of hireling under various leaders, and it was then that he made himself notorious by one particular nasty piece of work. One of the figures at court at the time of the anarchy was a Brahman called Pandit Jodha Ram. He was ranged on the one side while several others were on the other, and it happened that the Pandit's side went down and the side on which Alexander Gardiner was working went up. Pandit Jodha Ram was captured and they prepared to punish him with mutilation, by cutting off his nose, his fingers, ears, and so on. The question was who would do it. Nobody would touch this man, but Alexander Gardiner undertook and did it. When

the British came in, this unfortunate Pandit had to be compensated, and there is a special reference to the gift of a jagir to the Pandit who is spoken of "as the man mutilated by Colonel Gardiner." He cleared out in 1844 and went to start a business in Multan. There is a letter from him in which he claims to be an American subject born in Philadelphia—another lie, for we have contemporary evidence because he went to Ferozepore at that time on a visit to the British where his alleged Americanism failed under the influence of drink, and he revealed what he was a common Irish blue-jacket. After this business venture in Multan he went into the service of Maharaja Gulab Singh of Kashmir. And legend has it that here again he distinguished himself by what we may call an unsavoury incident. Like all Indian Rajahs, the Maharajah wanted to have some tosha-khana where he might deposit his treasure. Nobody knows where it is, except the reigning sovereign. Colonel Gardiner was instructed to carry out the work of making a tosha-khana in the Fort, and reported to the Maharajah that it was finished. Gulab Singh looked at it and said "You and I are the only two people who know where the tosha-khana is." Gardiner then informed the workman that the Raja was pleased with this work and would give them a feast. At the appointed hour when the bounteous feast was spread, Gardiner waited until the dishes were served, then when the men engaged in serving had gone, placed charcoal braziers in the room, locked the door and cleared out, returning in the morning to finish off the survivors. He lived to a fairly good old age and even about his death he lied. When he ultimately did die he claimed to be over 90, 98 to be precise. But a photograph which is taken late in his life does not show the man to be of anything like that age. Through the courtesy of the Roman Catholic Chaplain at Sialkot we were able to get a copy of the burial entry, and there is a note where the age 98 has been struck out and a more reasonable age that of 76 has been substituted. Thus even in his death he could not tell the truth.

I pass now from what we may call the combatants to the non-combatants. First of these I may mention Dr. Honigberger who

wrote his reminiscences in a book entitled "Thirty-five years in the East." He was a simple old man and wandered in the East, healing the people, using most extraordinary remedies, such as tigers' whiskers, powdered locusts, etc., He claimed to cure hydro phobia and glanders, two diseases which have puzzled the ablest of modern physicians, at any rate till inoculation was invented. He came here and stayed for some time and he was connected with Lahore. One interesting fact about him was that he set apart a house as a lunatic asylum. He described how when he was walking through the streets of Lahore, he met and cured a mad man with a potion, and this led him to open a lunatic asylum. His book is worth reading, and is in the University Library. He says he himself had cholera and cured himself by some fearful concoction.

Then comes another doctor who goes into the same class as Alexander Gardiner, a gentleman who would never tell the truth, Dr. Harlan, whose book "India and Afghanistan" was published in 1842. In a most pretentious and bombastic preface he claimed to have passed through most wonderful adventures in the heart of Asia, ascending the Himalayas—with a fearless band of troops behind him. All these can be written off and the truth about the man is that he was an American ship's doctor when he turned up at Calcutta at the time of the first Burmese War in 1826, in which he was employed as an assistant surgeon. It was a temporary appointment, and when the war was over he was out of a job and he drifted into the Punjab like so many others. Ranjit Singh did not like him very much, but he took him on temporarily. The only contact that Dr. Harlan had whatever with the north was when he was sent for a short time on an embassy to Kabul. His having ascended the Himalayas in anticipation of the modern climbers is all moonshine. The only appointment that he had in the Punjab was when for a short time he was the governor of Gujrat. He was deported in 1844, and the whole of his wonderful book can be written off as unreliable.

Another interesting figure is Charles Masson. He was a private in the Bengal Artillery and he deserted from the Bengal

Artillery in 1826 and went into the north. Though a simple private soldier, he was a man of considerable education, and he used his eyes in the course of his travels. His memoirs which can be read to-day are those of an educated man who went into Afghanistan and Baluchistan. It is really he who started the path which General Alexander Cunningham later followed in his examination of Indian antiquities. His book *Ariana Antiqua* was finally published by the East India Company for the benefit of Masson's mother. Masson collected a mass of information regarding coins, Buddhist relics and all kinds of historical antiquities. From his work one realizes how different things were in those days. Masson wandered about freely with probably 8 or 9 annas with him and no more ; and nobody molested him or worried him, whereas to-day if a single European wandered about in Central Asia where Masson wandered, the premium on his life would have to be very high. Masson and others wandered without any trouble whatever. He was much more useful as an investigator prior to his entering Government service. The Government, however, made him a kind of news-writer or, more plainly speaking, a spy, and when he was taken on in that capacity he lost a great deal of his opportunity, which he had before, of moving about, because the Afghans at once began to grow suspicious of him. He carried out an immense amount of investigation and worked in the north for many years. Then he got into Baluchistan and carried on his work there. But his work in Baluchistan was hampered by the fact that he, like others, became a victim to the young officers put in the political department, who particularly at the time of the Afghan War were apt to be offensive even to Senior Officers. The politicals in Baluchistan did not like Masson, and reported that he was intriguing with the Baluchis. Masson was imprisoned by one political who, not content with that, half-starved him. The military officers there were so annoyed at this that they insisted on Masson's being released. Masson ultimately gave up his work there (I might mention that in consideration of his services his desertion from the army had been overlooked), and he returned to

England and spent a large part of the remainder of his life in trying to get compensation for his bad treatment in Baluchistan and looking after his own financial interests in connection with his books. He became a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society. Before he died he came to be recognised as an authority, and his book is a standard work even to this day.

I now come to the last of the European adventurers in the Punjab, another Italian, Bianchi. He was a non-combatant, a road-maker ; and he came to the Punjab to make roads for Ranjit Singh. He sought to anticipate the present Public Works Department in that he offered to make a circular road all round the city of Lahore. He demanded Rs. 25,000 ; but the Maharajah would not give him more than 3,000, and so the circular road was still-born, and it remained for the modern Public Works Department to build it.

The period of adventures ends, as I have remarked several times, in 1844 when the bigger men were largely deported or resigned their places and the smaller men were swallowed up in the ranks of the Sikh army or were killed in battle. After that date we hear no more of any adventurers. It is a fascinating study, and I feel well repaid personally for the six years hard digging in the records of the Punjab.

The President proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer for his interesting and instructive lecture, and the meeting terminated.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY.

Speaking primarily to a gathering of teachers and students of history, and that at a short notice, I do not expect to bring before you any new facts, at any rate nothing that you could not all find for yourselves—if you looked for it.

My object rather is to emphasise a *point of view* with regard to the history of Ancient India. Those of us who approach the subject rather as *linguists* than as historians, deal constantly with almost the same material, though from a somewhat different angle.

We are interested in Kings and Emperors, not so much as political phenomena, not so much as benefactors of the human race, or the reverse, but rather as pegs on to which we may hang linguistic documents, as sign-posts which we may use in demarcating changes in grammar and pronunciation, in tracing the rise and fall of dialects, or the growth of the meaning of particular words. For such studies, it is necessary to deal with all the documents and all the linguistic evidence which are used by the historians of Ancient India. Moreover, as is obvious, we are bound to study the very words of those documents, and to study the actual languages we are talking about. Summaries and paraphrases are of no use to us, translations are only aids to study. Now when we turn to manuals of Indian History, the materials on which they are based are familiar to us, as also much of the discussion there has been about them. And yet the conclusions drawn in those Manuals, or rather many of the statements made in them, often seem to us very daring, and sometimes positively incorrect. If I am led to break a lance with the writers of text-books, especially little text-books, it is not that I do not appreciate their difficulties. They are perhaps trying to do something which should not be done at all. It is not that there has been no improvement. The manuals that I have seen lately are better than those of, say, fifteen years ago. I wish only to remind you of what it is all based upon, and to suggest that these writers should study their evidence more closely, so as to distinguish what is fact and what is theory.

Those of you who have had experience of extending College or Hostel buildings, will be familiar with the question : are the foundations strong enough to bear another storey, or perhaps two additional stories ? A similar question often suggests itself with regard to much that is written about Ancient India : are the foundations, the actual evidence, strong enough to bear the edifice that has been built upon them ?

Of the facts that are relied on, and accepted as safe and sure foundations, how many are really firmly fixed ? How many have

been arrived at by a process of rough estimating, or of calculating the mean of widely variant guesses ? How many of them are results depending on particular hypotheses or working theories : some of which have in the meantime broken down and crumbled away ? I have often congratulated myself, that I have never been required to teach Ancient Indian History to the very young. I should indeed be rather at a loss how to proceed. With the very young, one must, I suppose be dogmatic. One cannot follow every statement, with a "but perhaps it was not so," or a "very likely this happened at a different period, if it happened at all." Nor can very young minds be expected to appreciate evidence. At the same time it must be embarrassing to a teacher devoted to the truth if he is expected to teach his class a series of propositions, which he knows are based on most fragile evidence, and some of which may appear to be mutually contradictory.

I do not propose to solve this difficulty.

For children, the story, even the fairy-tale may be more valuable, more interesting, more inspiring than the dry facts of history. Even for their elders, an epic story like that of *Homer's Iliad*, or of *Valmiki's Ramayana*, both the works of great poets, have a value that is quite independent of their dates, of the situation of Lanka, of the question whether Achilles was a human King, or a tribal deity, of the symbolism that may be contained in the story of Sita, of Hanoman, or of the actual happenings that lie behind these wonderful stories. But we cannot build history on the imaginative pictures that poets have created out of older stories and lively fancy. The *Iliad* is itself an important historical fact, though its origin may be obscure. The ancient city site explored by Schliemann, city upon city, may well be that of the ancient Troy which figures in the Epic. That some real human struggle is figured in the poem is generally believed. That some of the names have come down from real persons is quite possible. But the old King Priam, and his son Paris, the wrath of Achilles and the slaying of Hector, like the interference of the Goddess Athene in the fighting : these things

are not historical facts. The descriptions of life are doubtless founded on fact, the intimate touches are warrant for that ; but the historian must be very cautious in applying these to a particular period. It is of no use guessing the date of the struggle, and then quoting everything in the poem as true of that date. In the same way the *Indian Epics* are themselves historical facts, the life they describe is based on real life. That there really was a great struggle on which the great Bharata poem was originally based, most people believe. But if we guess the date of the battle and then assign to that date everything that is contained in the poem, we are liable to get astray by many centuries.

To illustrate the difficulty of reducing undated phenomena to a chronological scale, I may quote a few sentences from a history manual. Speaking of the date of the Vedas (meaning, I think, of the Rigveda) the author mentions that European scholars consider 1200 B.C. as the latest possible date. He quotes the late Mr. Tilak's view that we have records of the social, political, moral and intellectual life of the Indians from 4500 B.C. He then says "In any case 3000 B.C. will not be far from the truth." But on his own showing, as far as evidence goes, it might be 10 or 15 centuries from the truth, either way. The same writer tells us that remains of the New Stone age go back "as far as 2000 B.C.," and later on he remarks that the discoveries made in the Indus Valley carry back the history of India 3,000 years before the birth of Christ.

Could we blame an intelligent student if he should conclude, that the Vedic age was probably, and the remains of Mohen-jodaro certainly, about a thousand years earlier than the New Stone Age. But the civilisation of Mohen-jodaro was chalcolithic, and the Rigvedic people were well acquainted with *ayas* which may have been originally bronze (*cf.* Latin *aes*) and not iron, but cannot have been stone. Nor can he possibly mean that Vedic civilization was Palæolithic.

Speaking of the date of the Mahabharata poem, the same writer mentions that there has been a great controversy, varying

from those that made it contemporary' with the incidents at the beginning of the Kali Yuga (put by the astronomers at 3101 B. C. down to those who put these events at about 1000 B.C. and the composition of the poem, as we have it, round about the beginning of the Christian era, expanded and completed before 500 A. D.

"*But the actual date of the composition is*" he says "purely a matter of conjecture." Then eight pages further on he says— "The Ramayana was composed almost at the same time as the Mahabharata."

Now this sort of thing arises from the use of various authorities dealing with evidence one has not thoroughly studied for oneself, or has not handled oneself. This leads me to two points which I venture to stress at once.

The first is that Indian History cannot be usefully compiled from various *authorities*, without any study of the nature of the facts known to those authorities, and without a knowledge of the quality of each authority, and the relation of one to the other. The second point is the need of a thorough knowledge of the language of documents used, and of the history of the critical study of those documents. Who would attempt to write a history of Ancient Italy without a thorough knowledge of the Latin language, without a training in the use of linguistic and archæological evidence, without exercising his judgment with regard to the reliability of his authorities? A journalist may do so, but not an historian.

I recognise of course one peculiar difficulty of Ancient Indian History. It is that a great block of Indian literature reflecting real life and real movements lies farther back than any events that can be dated with certainty. In England, exact history begins with Julius Cæsar, but there is no British literature older than that. The oldest Celtic books are several centuries later, however old some particular stories may be. *Roman* history starts with a strange story of the foundation of the City, and goes on with some very questionable accounts of the Kings; but before

the Republic there is no literature. Even in *Greece* apart from the Homeric poems there is no literature that goes back beyond the beginnings of dates.

To begin an account of *India* as Vincent Smith does with the *6th century B.C.* is to omit a long period of development that forms part of the background of Indian civilization. For all that I venture to question the value of impinging on the stories which a child learns at home, more as stories than as literal historical facts, with pseudo-history in tabloid form—concocted from theories old and new, guesses, conjectures, tradition of various ages, fancies and a few facts—hardly understood by many teachers, and probably not understood at all by the student. School-teaching, I think, should emphasise some of the broad facts that are certain without venturing into the earliest periods. Then Ancient Indian History should be taught only at a stage where it can be studied critically in connection with the evidence.

Dealing with degree students I have been in the habit of demanding for any statement, what is the evidence ? How do you know that ? What are the actual facts on which that conclusion is based ?

To begin with there are certain *chronological* land-marks.

I do not wish to overvalue dates, but they are more important in a period where there are so few.

I read, "Gautam Buddha died at the age of eighty in 487 B.C."

How do we know that ? The late Professor Rhys Davids writing in the Cambridge History of India (1922) (volume 1, page 171), said "The date 483 B.C. which is adopted in this History must still be regarded as provisional." The Ceylon chronicles say 218 years elapsed between Buddha's death and the beginning of Asoka's reign. But those 218 years were calculated on the basis of lists of Kings and teachers. The Professor wrote further "The fact is that all such calculations are of very doubtful validity when they have to be made backwards for any lengthened period." "As is well-known even the Christian chronologists, though the

interval they had to cover was very short, were wrong in the calculation of our Christian era." Of this Buddhist date he says, "But we do not know who made the calculation. We first hear of it in the fourth century A. D."

The late Mr. Vincent Smith (Early History of India, 4th Edition posthumous, 1924, page 49) wrote "The variety of dates assigned for the death of Buddha is almost past counting." Diwan Bahadur Pillai working from week-days calculated April 1st 478 B.C. The dotted record at Canton kept up till A. D. 489 had 975 dots = 486 B. C.) Some traditions support that date, but when was the dotted record started? We can hardly suppose that away in Canton they started with one dot just a year after the Buddha died. Mr. Vincent Smith misled by a new reading of the Kharavela inscription went back to 544-3. We may admit that 487 fits in quite well with the traditional date of the Jain Bhadra bahu.

It may very well be correct. But to the question how do we know that the Buddha died in 487 B.C.? The answer is, we do not know it.

Of the Sisunaga Dynasty I read "The fifth monarch of his family, Bimbisara, ruled Magadha from 582 to 554 B.C." How does the author know that? Answer : he does not know it. Let us turn to the Cambridge History (volume I, page 312). Professor Rapson writes "In the present corrupt condition of the text the various manuscripts of the Puranas attribute a reign of either 28 or 38 years to Bimbisara... Until the text has been restored by critical editing the authentic tradition of the Brahmans cannot be ascertained. In contrast with this discrepancy the Buddhist chronicles of Ceylon, the Dipavamsa and the Mahavamsa, offer a consistent and more detailed account of these reigns...." Whether this tradition is to be accepted as correct in preference to the other may be questioned : but it affords the best working hypothesis which has yet been discovered. The chronology, as determined by Professor Geiger was, Bimbisara's accession

543 B.C., death 491 B.C. Death of Buddha 483. Whence then 582 to 554 ? These are approximate dates c. 582 to c. 554 calculated by Mr. Vincent Smith as a correction of what he found in manuscripts of the Matsya Purana, reducing a total of 321 years assigned to a list of ten kings to a total 229. So we begin to see how very shaky are the foundations of these exact dates which our young students are invited to memorize.

One might speak for more than an hour on the difficulties of fixing the date of any event which occurred before the adoption of a common era as a standard of reference.

Such an era has to be maintained consistently for a long period and widely used. Even the Guptas were not content to use the Malava era (shown by Fleet to be the same as the Vikrama era) from 56 B.C., or the Saka era of 78 B.C., but used a new one starting from a year which has been equated with February 26, A.D. 320, to March 13, 321. Read any previous attempt to give an account of the first millennium of our era, and you will realize at once what a difference that determination of a certain point of chronology has made. Every teacher of Indian History should read Fleet's introduction to the 3rd volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* (Gupta Inscriptions).

We, who are used to printed calendars and daily newspapers, are apt to forget the initial difficulties of keeping an account of time, of recording events in such a way that it may not be forgotten when they happened—and still more of counting backwards once doubts and confusions have crept into the popular story.

Let us now consider on what sort of facts our knowledge of Ancient Indian History is based. What are the things to which we can point, or which we can bring into Court in support of our contentions ? Obviously we are dealing with a period far beyond the span of living memory. The repetition of popular stories from generation to generation will not help us much if we cannot trace those stories a long way back. Popular stories have a way of changing and developing and mingling with fairy-

tales and mythologies. The modern version is of no historical value if the tale was told quite differently a thousand years, or two thousand years ago. Compare the story of Buddha in the oldest Pali books with that which we find in modern Buddhist books—or in Edwin Arnold's 'Light of Asia.' To take this last as an historical document would be absurd, something like basing British History on Lord Tennyson's picture of King Arthur and his Knights, or early Roman history on Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome. The facts and things that we can use, may be classified as words and names, manuscripts of birch-bark, of palm-leaf and, much later, of paper, coins, inscribed rocks, stones and images, copper plates, and ancient sites with their works of art, common objects and their traces of buildings and methods of building. Or to put the same things in other terms, we have records of language on which linguists base certain theories and conclusions, we have texts of various kinds, inscriptions, coins and the other data of the archæologist.

I shall resist the temptation to speak to you at length on linguistic theories, and take only one specimen statement as taught to young students and ask what sort of evidence it rests upon. All students learn something about the Aryans. They are told, for instance, that "in the beginning the Aryans settled in the North-West Frontier and the Punjab, that they came with their families and maintained unsullied their Aryan blood and culture." And further—"A second wave of the Aryan invaders came by Gilgit and Chitral and established themselves in the plains of the Ganges and the Jumna. Most probably they could not bring their families, and therefore formed alliances with the Dravidians." Now I shall not quarrel with the first part of the statement. The Rigveda and the Avesta show us to the North-West of India, on both sides of the Frontier, tribes who called themselves Aryas, speaking closely related languages, the older being that of the Rigveda. Related to these two languages there is of course a chain of other languages stretching to the West of Europe—including Greek, Latin (and its descendants), English,

German, Russian, etc. This great family of languages is known as the Indo-European family. The similarity of these languages consists not only in the possession of a common vocabulary, but also in common features of grammar. Of the words common to this great group the best known perhaps are those expressing family relationship, father, mother, brother, and those expressing number : Sanskrit, *trayas trīni*, Greek *treis, tria*; Latin *tres*; English *three*; German *drei*. I will mention only one example of a grammatical form to illustrate hundreds. English *is* corresponds to Sanskrit *asti*, Greek *esti*, Latin *est*, Russian *yest*, German *ist*, etc. Now all these resemblances are so numerous and so regular that it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that all these languages are derived from a common source. To that common source we have given the name of Indo-European, and by detailed comparison we can deduce a great deal about the character of that language. But we do not know where that Indo-European original was spoken, or who the speakers of it were. There are, however, many indications which point to the conclusion that this type of language was brought into India from the North-West.

The second part of the statement is on a very different footing. A second wave, we are told, came by Gilgit and Chitral, and these people established themselves in the Ganges-Jamna plains, having left their families behind. This is very interesting, it is so definite; but whence, we may ask, does the author get this precise, even intimate, information ? Are there any ancient songs about it ? Not one. Is there an inscription in some rocky defile of Chitral recording the passage of this host ? Of course there is nothing of the kind. Are there any references in histories or in books of any kind to this expedition ? Are there any passages, however obscure, that can be supposed to refer to it ? Nothing of the sort has been found. What then is it based upon. On nothing but the classification of the modern Indo-Aryan languages and the Prakrits before them. The whole thing started with Hœrnle's comparison of Western Hindi with Eastern Hindi (with which he included what is now generally

called Bihari). Extending his enquiry to other Indian languages, he found that some features of the Eastern languages re-occur in the North-West. To account for this he suggested that a later body of Aryans might have forced their way through to the centre. Sir George Grierson developed this theory with a much greater wealth of material. It is true that the Outer Band of the Indo-Aryan languages differs from the Central group. It is true that the languages of the Outer Band have certain features more or less in common. I will give you only one example. Western Hindi and Central dialects have only one sibilant dental *s*, Bengali has instead a palatal *sh*. In the North-West we have both *s* and *sh*. But the theory of the second invasion is not necessary to explain these facts, it has not been accepted by other linguists of the same standing, and even Sir George Grierson has modified his attitude somewhat in his later writings. Unfortunately just when the theory was at its strongest it received official recognition in India—appearing in a Census Report and the Imperial Gazetteer.

The route *via* Chitral and Gilgit, a most difficult route, was suggested because every other route seemed to be barred by serious objections.

Then the absence of families was suggested by another writer who was seeking a reason for mixed marriages, and thought he found it in Grierson's army of invaders who could not have brought many women by such a difficult route. What became of the deserted wives, or whether they perished on the road is not explained, nor have those hypothetically hard-hearted adventurers left the slightest trace of regret.

I shall not press the point that there were probably other people in India to marry besides Aryans and Dravidians, and wish only to convince you that this very definite statement about a second Aryan invasion rests on linguistic facts that can be explained without adopting this particular theory, for which no specific confirmation has been found.

Of the *texts* available, some important ones have been written outside India, especially in Greek and in Chinese, but those with which we are mainly concerned are written in the Indian languages, Sanskrit, Pali or some other Prakrit.

As is well known, there is very little in this vast literature that we can class as history. There are the Ceylon chronicles, there are endless stories and marvellous lives of holy men—but not until the 12th century A. D. do we find anything like a critical history in the *Rajatarangini* of Kalhana in Kashmir. For the centuries of Kashmir history approaching his own time *Kalhana* had tested tradition with written documents, with temple inscriptions and the like, but for remoter periods he had nothing but the traditions of the chronologers and remote dates, which seem to have been calculated by the astronomers.

As a consequence, his dates for the Mauryas can be proved to be wrong by several centuries.

Now the great difficulty in using so much of this rich literature for the illustration of our history of India is that most of it is not dated. Moreover, most of it is written in a learned literary language that changed very slowly, much more slowly than the colloquial speech of the bazars. So far no one has been able to establish definite criteria by which one can date a Sanskrit book from its style to within 3 or 4 centuries. Take, for instance, the *Kautiliya Arthashastra*. Does that really date from Mauryan times, or Gupta times or somewhere between the two? That there can be any doubt ranging over six or more centuries indicates the difficulty of dating by the style of languages.

Another point has always to be borne in mind. There are few books in India which, in the process of copying and recopying, have not been added to, more or less.

The Rigveda is an exception. Its specially sacred character led to safeguards being devised at an early period for the purity of the text, but the Mahabharata has gradually grown to its enormous bulk, the current version of the Ramayana has two

beginnings. It is quite likely that the Arthashastra is an old book with later additions. If so, can we determine which is old and what is later ? If not, is it safe to use it as evidence of the condition of Indian Society in the Mauryan period ? It is only necessary to read the headings of the chapters to see, that if this work can be dated with certainty, it becomes an historical document of the first order. We have already touched on the deplorable condition of the Purana manuscripts.

With regard to texts then I would stress the following points :—

- (1) The first necessity is to determine as nearly as we can what was the original text, or how much of it is probably correct.
- (2) We have to determine the age or the approximate age of that original text, and use its evidence accordingly.
- (3) It follows that we cannot depend upon translations, but must at least be able to control these by a knowledge of the language sufficient for the intelligent use of a critical text.

There is here an enormous mass of work waiting to be done. It requires an army of patient devoted workers, each of whom may be content to lay a single brick straight and true in the temple of learning.

On the importance of *inscriptions* it should be no longer necessary to insist. Though we may often be disappointed that the information they give is not more copious, and is sometimes obscure, they have the great advantage of being *contemporary documents*, and they are generally dated.

It is well known that the history of the Gupta period has been reconstructed mainly on the evidence of inscriptions and coins. So important a ruler as Samudra-Gupta, who was a patron of the arts and of poets, would hardly be known to us at all, if we had to depend on the evidence of literature.

The history of the Kushans, apart from some wonderful stories in Buddhist books about Kanishka, depends almost entirely on inscriptions and coins.

I have no time to describe or classify the numerous inscriptions of North India not to mention the many hundreds that have been found in South India. So I will refer only to one particular rock. That is a large granite boulder at Girnar just outside the town of Junagadh in Kathiawar. There are three distinct inscriptions on that rock, belonging to different ages. There is a version of Asoka's edicts dating from the 3rd century B. C. Then there is an inscription dated in the equivalent of 150 A. D. in the reign of the Satrap Rudradaman, relating to the bursting of the dam which formed an artificial lake, which had been made in Mauryan times, and to its repair. Finally there is the third inscription of the Gupta period (485 A. D.) which records the second bursting of the dam, and its repair. Here by an accident we have direct evidence of the permanence of a particular work through so many centuries and its repair on two occasions, which to my mind is better evidence of settled and methodical Government than many loose generalisations. With regard to the edicts of Asoka, a large subject in itself, I wish to refer to only one word. I find in a small text-book the following statement :

"The Lieges, Commissioners, and the District Officers were required to attend the General Assembly every five years. In these meetings they discussed the public questions and specially they received instructions from the Buddhist teachers in the Law of Piety." Now that statement rests on a mistranslation of a sentence in the Third Edict. You can find the original words in Hultzsch (*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Volume 1, new edition) in my own edition, or in an excellent book on Asoka by Professor Radhakumud Mukerji. The meaning as now understood is this—"Everywhere in my dominions the Yuktas, the Rajuka and the Pradesika shall set out on a complete tour every five years for this very purpose (*viz.*), for the following instruction in morality as well as for other business."

So we have directions for touring officers and the 'General Assembly' disappears in mist. Whence had the author obtained the idea? It arose from a misunderstanding of one particular word *anu-sam-yānam*. That was taken by Senart, a pioneer translator of this Edict, to mean "assembly." But comparison with other passages, and with other words in Sanskrit and Pali formed with the same prepositions, soon showed that it meant moving around in turn or succession, and so a 'tour.' The 'assembly' has been abandoned by scholars for many years. Unfortunately it was retained by the late Mr. Vincent Smith in his little book on Asoka (1st edition. In the last edition he follows a suggestion of Mr. Jayaswal that has been accepted by nobody else). So here again we see the danger of blindly following an authority, especially one who is not thoroughly versed in the language of the document in question. With inscriptions also it is not safe to accept without question the first translation one happens to come across.

Coming now to Archaeology proper, though this was originally proposed as the subject of this third lecture at the Historical Conference, I must be very brief.

The main thing I want to say is that although so much has been done by the Archaeological Department during the last 25 years under the direction of Sir John Marshall, there is still an enormous deal waiting to be done.

It is satisfactory that more attention is now given to archaeological research, and that so much progress has been made not only in contributions to general history, but also in unravelling the history of Indian Art. Many of you must be familiar with the excellent work that has been done at Taxila in particular, and you have had some opportunities of viewing some of the finds from Harappa and Mohen-jo-daro. These last, it is true, have not yet been brought into definite connection with the rest of Indian History, but they open up a vista of possibilities.

This Indus valley culture, which is estimated to date back to the third millennium B. C. resembles, if it is not related to, what is found elsewhere over a wide area belonging to a chalcolithic period, that is, a period in which stone instruments continue to be used side by side with copper. You have probably all seen specimens or reproductions of seals with excellent engravings of animals and plants. Even more important, if we can ever decipher it, is the writing on those seals.

Now all this is only a beginning. There is still a vast amount of work to be done. There are many sites awaiting excavation, famous historic sites and prehistoric sites whose ancient names we do not know. Of the first class I may mention Ujjain, an ancient capital, which Asoka considered important enough to be governed by a Prince as Viceroy. A great commercial centre, it was also the home of astronomers from which, as from Greenwich, longitudes were reckoned. The examination of such a site can hardly fail to yield valuable information.

In the Indus Valley and the Punjab there are many mounds yet to be explored, some of which will very likely yield additional evidence of the period represented by Harappa.

There is much to do. More in fact than Government can find money for. Hence I may mention a proposition that was discussed by the Council of the Oriental Congress recently held in Lahore. The suggestion was that the assistance of other countries should be welcomed ; that Universities and other learned bodies of this and other countries should be allotted sites for excavation, provided that properly qualified persons were employed for the work. All finds of a unique character would remain in the country, but a proportion of other finds would belong to the institutions conducting the excavations.

In connection with this, there occurs to me an idea, which is not practical at the moment, but which some day might come true—why should not the University of the Punjab have its own

Department of Archæology, and its own particular site to excavate, where it could train investigators in the field ? Whether the work is done in the library or whether it be done in the field, there is much to do ; and my contention is that only by actual labour on texts, on inscriptions, or in the soil can a teacher gain that sense of reality in his work that will enable him to make Ancient Indian History a live subject, and to teach it on true foundations.

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No. _____

Book No. _____

Accession No. _____

APPENDIX A.

The Fourth Historical Conference of the University of the Punjab to be held in Lahore, January 14th, 15th and 16th, 1929, by Authorisation of the Syndicate of the University and under the Presidency of Dr. Arthur Percival Newton, M.A., D.Lit., Rhodes Professor of Imperial History in the University of London.

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME.

MONDAY, JANUARY FOURTEENTH.

10-00 A. M. : Formal Opening of the Conference by the Vice-Chancellor of the University.

(after which Dr. A. P. Newton, M.A., D. Lit., will take the Chair as President of the Conference.)

10-05—10-25 : Paper—"The Place of History in Education"—Dr. A. P. Newton.

10-25—11-30 : Discussion.....to be led by—

(a) Pandit Siri Ram, M.A., Professor of History, D. A.-V. College, Lahore.

(b) U. N. Ball, Esquire, M.A., Professor of History, Dyal Singh College, Lahore.

(This and subsequent discussions will be summed up by the President.)

11-30—11-50 : "The Relation of History to Allied Subjects"

A. C. C. Hervey, Esquire, M.A., Principal, Government Intermediate College, Ludhiana.

11-50—1-00 : Discussion.....to be led by —

(a) N. C. Daruwala, Esquire, M.A., Professor of English, Khalsa College, Amritsar.

(b) A. M. Dalaya, Esquire, B.A. (Oxon), LL.B., Professor of History, Edwardes College, Peshawar.

2-30 P. M. : Visit to the Fort and Palace of the Mughals.

Buses and motors will leave the University Hall at 2-30. The party will assemble within the Fort in the Hall of Audience, where a brief explanatory address will be given by the Secretary, after which various parts of the Fort will be visited. The aim in this and in successive visits will be to demonstrate recent methods of historical illustration. Emphasis will be laid upon the historical rather than the archaeological features of the place visited.

6-15 P.M.: Public Lecture....."European Adventurers in the Punjab."

Lieutenant-Colonel H. L. O. Garrett, M.A., F. R. Hist. S., Principal, Government College, Lahore.

Chairman—The Hon'ble Sir Shadi Lal, Kt., Chief Justice.

(The evening lectures will be delivered in the University Hall.)

TUESDAY, JANUARY FIFTEENTH.

10-00 A.M.: Paper—"The Content of the Historical Curriculum."—Dr. A. P. Newton.

10-20—11-30: Discussion—to be led by.....—

(a) Gulshan Rai, Esquire, M.A., Professor of History, Sanatana Dharma College, Lahore.

(b) Amolak Ram, Khanna Esquire, M.A., Lecturer in English and History, Government College, Lahore.

11-30 A.M.: Paper—"The History Curriculum at Various Stages."—Sita Ram, Kohli, Esquire, M.A., Lecturer in History, Government College, Lahore.

11-50—1-00: Discussion—to be led by.....—

(a) Abdul Qadir, Esquire, M.A., Professor of History, Islamia College, Lahore.

(b) Peter Ponsonby, Esquire, M.A., Professor of History, Gordon College, Rawalpindi.

2-30 P.M.: Visit to Shahdara—"The Pleasance of the Mughals."

Buses and motors will leave the University Hall at 2-30. They will assemble within the outer enclosure—the Sarai—at 2-50, where a brief explanatory address will be given by the Rev. J. B. Weir, M.A., Lecturer in History, Forman Christian College, after which various parts of the Garden and the Tombs will be visited.

This will be followed by a Garden-Party given to Members of the Conference by the Vice-Chancellor of the University.

4-00 P.M.: Garden-Party in the Shahdara Gardens.

6-15 P.M.: Public Lecture—Dr. Arthur Percival Newton, M.A., D. Lit.
"Main Currents of World Policy, 1878—1914."

Chairman—His Excellency the Governor of the Punjab.

(Note—This is the first of a series of six lectures on this subject to be delivered by Dr. Newton on the successive Monday evenings.)

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY SIXTEENTH.

10-00 A.M.: Paper—"The Encouragement of Historical Investigation."—Dr. A. P. Newton.

10-20—11-30: Discussion.

11-30 A.M.: Paper—"The Punjab Records as Sources for Investigation by Post-Graduate Students."—Principal H. L. O. Garrett.

11-50—1-00: Discussion.

2-30 P.M.: Visit to the Lahore Museum.

The party will assemble at the entrance to the Museum at 2-30 and will be conducted through the Museum by the Curator, Dr. K. N. Sita Ram, M.A., Ph.D.]

6-15—Public Lecture: "The Foundations of Early Indian History." A. C. Woolner, Esquire, M.A., Vice-Chancellor, University of the Punjab.

Members of the Conference who require accommodation during their stay in Lahore are requested to write to the Secretary.

As the time for discussion of each subject is strictly limited, members who wish to participate in the discussions are requested to send their names to the President immediately after the reading of the introductory Paper.

Arrangements have been made for the publication of the Proceedings of the Conference. Copies will be available at approximately Rs. 1-4-0 per copy.

ROSS WILSON,
Secretary-Convener.

APPENDIX B.

Courses of Reading in History Prescribed by the University of Delhi.

1. INTERMEDIATE COURSE.

1929 AND 1930.

Paper (a)—British History.—Students will be expected to show some knowledge of the great movements of English History and to have some idea of the continuity of History.

Special emphasis will be placed on the following subjects :—

1. The Growth of the Nation.
2. The Growth of Parliament.
3. The Growth of the Empire.
4. The Industrial Revolution.

Teachers will be expected to emphasize the biographical element of history. An elementary knowledge of related Geography will be required, for which outline maps will be provided.

Books recommended—

Either G. B. Smith—Outline of British History.

Or R. L. Mackie—A Short Political and Social History of Britain.

For further reading—

R. B. Mowat—History of Great Britain.

Trevelyan—History of England.

Green—Short History of the English People.

Seeley—The Expansion of England.

Higham—History of the British Empire.

R. Muir—School Atlas of English History.

Macmillan—Historical Atlas of Europe.

Paper (b)—

Either—

- (i) Outline of the History of Civilization, with special reference to Medieval India, 712—1526.

Books recommended—

Hoyland—Brief History of Civilization.

Renouf—Outlines of General History.

Lane-Poole—Medieval India from Contemporary Sources (relevant portions)

Garrett and Kohli—History of India, Part II, pages 1—146.

Or—

- (ii) Outline of the History of Civilization, with special reference to Ancient India.

Books recommended—

Hoyland—Brief History of Civilization.

Renouf—Outlines of General History.

Vincent Smith—Oxford History of India, Part I.

Mukarji—Men and Thought in Ancient India.

II. B.A. PASS COURSE.

1929 AND 1930.

Paper I—General Survey of the Main Tendencies of Indian History from 1500, A.D., to the Present Day.

The course is to conduce to the study of—

- (i) Pre-British Empires, 1500—1761 ;
- (ii) The Dominion of the East India Company ;
- (iii) The Growth of Present-day India, 1857—1924 :

and to ensure appreciation by the students of the principles of historical continuity, and of the influence of great personalities.

As a guide to the study of these main heads the following broad movements and tendencies may be cited :—

(i) Pre-British Empires—

1. The significance of the XVI century in Indian History ; a survey of the political, social, economic and religious condition of Northern India on the eve of Babar's invasion ; the political, social, economic and religious condition of the Deccan in the XVI century.
2. The forces that made for the growth of the Mughal Empire and its extent in the days of Akbar and Aurangzeb.
3. The growth and characteristics of the administrative system of the Mughal Empire (including Sher Shah).
4. Religious Thought in India in the XVI century, and the evolution of Akbar's religion.
5. Revival of Learning (including architecture, painting, etc.) and the social and economic condition of India during the Mughal Empire.
6. European travellers in India during the Mughal Empire, and the light thrown by them on the condition of the people of the country.
7. Sikhism as a religious and political system.
8. The causes of the decay of the Mughal Empire.
9. The causes of the rise of the Maharattas ; the administrative system of Shivaji ; the character of the Maharatta Confederacy ; the extent of the Maharatta Empire.

(ii) The Dominion of the East India Company—

Section 1—The character of the European settlements in India.

The character of the occupation of India by the East India Company; the growth in outline of the British dominion in India.

Section 2—The political condition of India about the middle of the 18th century.

Section 3—The growth of the administrative system of the East India Company.

Section 4—The Kingdom of Ranjit Singh and its relations with British India.

Section 5—The work of Ram Mohan Roy; the Reforms of Bentinck and Dalhousie.

Section 6—The political and religious condition of India on the eve of the Mutiny; the causes and effects of the Mutiny.

(iii) The growth of Present Day India, 1857-1914—

Section 1.—The growth of the Indian administration and constitution.

Section 2—The growth of Nationalism and the Press, the development of educational policy, and the chief religious movements up to 1920.

Section 3—The foreign relations of India, with special reference to the North-West Frontier, Afghanistan and the Dominions.

Section 4—The political relations of the Native States with the paramount power.

N.B.—The Board of Studies may, from time to time, select certain of the movements, etc., above-mentioned to be commended especially to the attention of students.

Paper II—

Part (i) Outline of the History of Europe from 1815 to 1920.

Part (ii) General study of the institutions of the following States, with special reference to India, viz., England, United States of America, France, Germany, Switzerland.

Books recommended.

The following is the revised list of books for Paper I—

PART I.

Rushbrook-Williams : An Empire Builder of the 16th Century
(First and last chapters).

V. A. Smith : Akbar, Chapters 6, 8, 12, 13, 14 and 15.

Beni Pershad : Jehangir, Chapter on Administration.

Lane-Poole : Aurangzeb (Rulers of India Series).

Ranade : Rise of the Mahratta Power, Chapters 1, 7, 8, 9, 10 and
11.

Havell : Aryan Rule in India, Chapters 7, 8, 11—20.

Oaten : European Travellers in India.

For Reference—

V. Smith : History of the Fine Arts in India and Ceylon, Parts
II and III.

Part II—

P. E. Roberts : History of British India, Part I.

Ramsay Muir : Making of British India.

Malleson : Ranjit Singh (Rulers of India Series).

Part III—

H. Dodwell : History of India, 1858—1918.

V. Chirol : India (Modern World Series).

Montagu-Chelmsford Report. Chapters 1—8.

Sir W. Vincent : The Defence of India (India of To-day Series).

Sapre : Growth of the Indian Constitution (Specified Portions).

For reference.—

Chablani : Readings in the Indian Constitution and Adminis-
tration.

"India" (Current Issue)

Paper II—Hazen—Europe since 1815. Edition 1928.

Lowell—Greater European Governments.

Sir F. Whyte—India—A Federation.

Horne—The Political System of British India.

Woodrow Wilson—The State, for the constitutions of
the United States of America.

Chablani—Readings in the Indian Constitution and
Administration.

For reference.—

Bryce : American Commonwealth Modern Democracies.

III. HONOURS COURSE.

1929 AND 1930.

Main Subject.

Paper I—Indian History, 1500—1919.—This will consist primarily of the Pass Course more intensively studied. In addition some knowledge of the 15th century voyages of discovery to India, of the Portuguese Empire, and of the Dutch, English and French Settlements will be expected.

Paper II—Comparative Politics and the History of Political Science—

- (a) The main constitutions of the modern world, and the chief modern political forms, e.g., England and the Dominions, United States of America, France, Switzerland, Russia and India.
- (b) The development of political societies in Europe from Greece to the present day, viz., Greece, Rome, The Mediæval State, the Renaissance State, and the enlightened despots, the modern Parliamentary State.
- (c) Ancient Indian Polity.

Paper III—Modern European History, 1453—1914.

Up to 1789 a general knowledge only shall be required, attention being chiefly paid to the Renaissance, the rise of Nationalism, the causes of the French Revolution and the growth of Colonial Empires. A knowledge of the religious wars shall only be expected as they affect these three.

From 1789—1914 special emphasis shall be placed on the following :—

The French Revolution, Napoleon, Nationalism, Bureaucracy, Industrialism, Imperialism, and the causes of the War.

Paper IV—A special Period of English, Indian or European History including some Great Movements.

Paper V—A Vernacular paper or an Essay on any Historical Subject.

Books recommended (in addition to those in the Pass Course)—

- Paper I—* 1. V. Smith—History of the Fine Arts in India and Ceylon. (Relevant chapters).
- 2. Erskine—History of India under Babar and Humayun.
- 3. Sarkar—Mughal Administration. (Latest edition).
- 4. Qanungo—Sher Shah. (Relevant chapters).

5. Moreland—India at the Death of Akbar.
6. Sarkar—Shivaji and his Times (first and last chapters).
7. Ain-i-Akbari—Portions relating to the Revenue system of the Mughals (Articles of Yusuf Ali and Moreland on Akbar's Revenue Policy in Royal Asiatic Journal).
8. Dodwell—Dupleix and Clive.
9. Elphinstone—Rise of the British Power in the East.
10. Rawlinson—British Beginnings in Western India.
11. Panikar—The Native States of India.
12. R. C. Dutt—England and India.
13. Farquhar—Modern Religious Movements in India.
14. Gargil—Industrial Revolution in India.

Paper II—Books recommended—

- (a) J. A. R. Marriott—English Political Institutions. (New edition).
 Lowell—Governments and Parties in Continental Europe.
 Temperley—Senates and Second Chambers.
 Russell—Roads to Freedom.
 Lowell—Public Opinion and Popular Governments.
 Keith—Responsible Government in the Dominions.

For Reference—

- Bryce—Modern Democracies.
 Low—Governance of England.
 Bryce—American Commonwealth.

- (b) Sidgwick—Development of European Polity.
 W. Fowler—City State of Greeks and Roman.
 Bryce—Holy Roman Empire.
 Pollock—History of Science of Politics.
 (c) Arthasastra—Translated by Shamasastri.
 Shamasastri—Evolution of Indian Polity.

Paper III—Modern European History—

- (a) Acton—Lectures in Modern History.
 Hoyland—Europe, 1494—1914.
 (b) Mignet—History of French Revolution.
 H. Rose—Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era, 1789-1815.
 Hazen—Europe since 1815.
 Marriott—The Eastern Question.
 G. Robertson—Bismarck.

168 FOURTH HISTORICAL CONFERENCE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB.

Robinson and Beard—Readings in the Development of Modern Europe.

Seignobos—History of Contemporary Civilisation.

For reference—

H. Rose—Napoleon.

Acton—Lectures on French Revolution. The Cambridge Modern History, Volumes X, XI, XII, XIII.

H. A. L. Fisher—Bonapartism.

Paper IV—The Industrial Revolution, 1760—1840.

(**NOTE**—This shall include the new inventions and their effect on social conditions and the development of industry, the rise of Trade Unions, social legislation up to 1840, Poor Relief Administration and the Agrarian Revolution.)

Books recommended—

J. B. L. Hammond—The Rise and Growth of Modern Industry.

A. Toynbee—The Industrial Revolution.

Waters—The Economic History of England. (Relevant chapters).

G. M. Trevelyan—British History in the 19th century.

For reference—

The Cambridge Modern History. (Relevant chapters).

W. Cunningham—The Industrial Revolution.

W. Cunningham—Essays on Western Civilisation, Part II (dealing with the Industrial Revolution).

Meredith—Economic History of England.

J. B. L. Hammond—Life of Lord Shaftesbury.

Graham Wallas—Life of Francis Place.

G. D. H. Cole—A Short History of the British Working-class Movement, Volume I (1789—1848).

Subsidiary Subject—Any one of the following groups :—

(a) Any two papers of the following :—

(i) Economics, Paper I (Pass).

(ii) Economics, Paper II (Pass).

(iii) Economics, Paper III (Honours).

(iv) Economics, Paper IV (a) (Economic History) (Honours).

(b) English Paper III (Honours) and English Paper IV (Honours).

(c) English Paper IV (Honours) and Economics Paper IV (a) Economic History (Honours).

(d) Philosophy Paper I (Pass) and English Paper IV (Honours).

QUALIFYING TEST IN ENGLISH COMPOSITION.

The same as Paper II of English in the B.A. Pass Course.

SRI PRAVATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No.

Book No.

Accession No.

SRI PRAVATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No.

Book No.

Accession No.

SRI PRAVATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No.

Book No.

Accession No.